BS 1180 K8 1924
Kyle, Melvin Grove, 1858-1933.
The Deciding voice of the monuments
n Biblical criticism : an introduction to
ne study of Biblical archaeology Rev.
3 1539 0007983

BS 1180 .K8
Kyle, Melvin Grove.
The deciding voice of the
monuments in Biblical

BS 1180 .K8
Kyle, Melvin Grove.
The deciding voice of the
monuments in Biblical

WILLIAM CAREY INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
LATOURETTE LIBRARY
1539 East Howard Street
Pasadena, California 91104

DEMCO

Don M. McCurry, Jr.
Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary
1953

DATE DUE

DEMCO 38-297

1180
K8

THE DECIDING VOICE

OF THE

MONUMENTS

IN

BIBLICAL CRITICISM

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

BY

MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D.

President of Xenia Theological Seminary
Editor of Bibliotheca Sacra
Archaeological Editor of the Sunday School Times

REVISED EDITION

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY
OBERLIN, OHIO
1924

25-587

Copyright 1924
by
Bibliotheca Sacra Company

composed and printed at the
WAVERLY PRESS
By the Williams & Wilkins Company
Baltimore, U. S. A.

Property of
Latourette Library
WCIU

To

GEORGE FREDERICK WRIGHT, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A.

In Gratitude and Affection

CONTENTS

PAGE

Preface ..... xi, xv
Introduction by the Reverend Professor James Orr, D.D. xvii

CHAPTER I

The subject stated, defined, and analyzed 1

PART I. THE FUNCTION OF ARCHÆOLOGY IN CRITICISM

CHAPTER II

Archæology supplies the historical setting of Scripture 11

CHAPTER III

Archæology gives guidance to methods of criticism 20
I. Concerning presuppositions 20
II. Concerning the canons of criticism 21
III. Concerning the value and influence of literary form 23
IV. Concerning the interpretation of ancient literature 26

CHAPTER IV

Archæology provides facts with which to test critical theories 30
I. No theory to be finally accepted and made applicable to faith and life until tested and attested by facts 32
II. A theory which meets all the known conditions of the case in hand not by that fact proved to be true 33
1. In life 35
2. In literature 36
3. In history 39
III. Only archæology is bringing forth any new facts on the questions raised by criticism 40

PART II. THE HISTORY OF THE TESTING OF CRITICAL THEORIES BY ARCHÆOLOGICAL FACTS

Chapter V

PAGE

Theories not affecting historicity or integrity of Scripture 45
I. Theories corroborated 48
1. The geographical and topographical trustworthiness of Scripture 48
2. The ethnographical correctness of Scripture 52
3. Biblical chronology a real system and trustworthy .. 54
4. The correctness of the imagery of the Bible 58
5. The accuracy of Scripture in both the original and the copies 61

Chapter VI

Theories not affecting historicity or integrity of Scripture 63
I. Theories corroborated—continued 63
6. The location of the Garden of Eden 63
7. The geological theory of the flood 64
8. The geological theory of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah 68
9. The relation between the mysterious Hyksos kings of Egypt and the Patriarchs 69

Chapter VII

Theories not affecting historicity or integrity of Scripture 75
II. Theories discredited 75
1. Abraham a pioneer of civilization 75
2. The mysterious character of Melchizedek 77
3. The old assumed system of epochal chronology for early Bible history 78

Chapter VIII

Theories affecting the historicity or integrity of Scripture 81
I. Theories discredited 82
1. The ignorance of the Partriarchal age 82
2. The Nomadic, semi-barbarous condition of Palestine in Patriarchal times and the impossibility of high religious ideas among the Patriarchs 87
3. The evolution of Israel's culture from a Palestinian origin and environment 93
4. Anachronisms 97

CHAPTER IX

PAGE

Theories affecting the historicity or integrity of Scripture..... 101
I. Theories discredited—continued..... 101
5. The mythical character of the early narratives of the Bible..... 101
II. Theories corroborated..... 112

CHAPTER X

Theories now challenged..... 114
I. Babylonian origin of Semitic culture..... 115
II. The gradual invasion of Palestine..... 119
III. The post-Christian view of the Hermetic writings..... 123
IV. The derogatory view of the Alexandrian dialect in New Testament Greek..... 125

CHAPTER XI

Reconstructive theories not confirmed..... 127
I. The unhistorical character of Genesis xiv..... 129
II. The Patriarchs not persons but personifications..... 137
III. The rude and crude civilization of Palestine in Patriarchal days..... 142

CHAPTER XII

Reconstructive theories not confirmed—continued..... 143
IV. The desert Egypt..... 143
V. The comparative unimportance of Moses as a lawgiver..... 145
VI. The naturalistic origin of Israel's religion from astral myths..... 149
VII. The late authorship of the Pentateuch..... 154
VIII. The incompleteness of the book of Job..... 173

CHAPTER XIII

Fallacies: The source of diverse conclusions among honest and sincere seekers after truth..... 174
I. Fallacies introduced by presuppositions..... 175
II. The fallacy of deduction without comparison, or without sufficient induction..... 177
III. The fallacy of seeking after discord..... 178
IV. The fallacy of excluding a part of the evidence..... 180
V. The fallacy of unscientific speculation..... 182
VI. The bugaboos of interpretation..... 184

CHAPTER XIV

PAGE

Canons of Research 189
Canon I. On common sense 191
Canon II. On the harmony of truth 197
Canon III. On security of truth 200
Canon IV. On the compatibility of facts with each other. 200
Canon V. On the continuity of nature 202
Canan VI. On the Importance of examining evidence 207
Canon VII. On the reliability of conclusions 208
Canon VIII. On the categories of interpretation 211
Canon IX. On Speculation as an implement of research. 212

CHAPTER XV

Methods of Research 214
I. In apologetics 216
II. In hermeneutics 217

PART III. THE PROGRESS OF ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN TESTING THE BIBLICAL NARRATIVE AND SETTLING QUESTIONS RAISED BY CRITICISM

CHAPTER XVI

The beginnings of history—Patriarchal Period 221
I. The handmaids of history 223
II. The dispersion 230
III. The rise of civilizations 231

CHAPTER XVII

Beginnings of history—Patriarchal Period continued 237
VI. The source and course of Semitic culture 237
V. Babylonian influence in Canaan 237

CHAPTER XVIII

The later Patriarchal Period 246
I. Palestinian civilization in the Patriarchal age 246
II. The first Pilgrim Father 248
III. The Patriarchal reception in Egypt 250
IV. Destruction of the cities of the Plain 253
V. The beginnings of revelation and of Israel's institutions .. 255
VI. Isaac 257

Chapter XIX

PAGE

The tribal period 259
I. The descent into Egypt and the sojourn there 259
II. Hebrew slavery in Egypt 267
III. Moses 275

Chapter XX

The tribal period—continued 277
IV. The Exodus 277
V. The tabernacle in the wilderness 280
VI. The turning back from Kadesh-Barnea 283
VII. The Pentateuchal question 284

Chapter XXI

The national period 295
I. The wideness of God's providence 295
II. The genealogical lists 297
III. The times of the conquest 299
IV. The political horizon of the two kingdoms 308
1. Egypt 309
2. Philistia 316
3. Moab 316
4. Syria 319
5. Assyria 320
6. Babylonia 322
V. The prophetic history and literature 322
1. The unity of Isaiah 324
2. The life and book of Daniel 329

Chapter XXII

Conclusion 337
Appendix 341
Subject index 355

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

I will not indulge myself by yielding to the very insidious temptation to say in the preface what one has forgotten to say in the book, but will keep strictly to the delightful task of expressing my gratitude to those who have helped me. Here I am so embarassed that I am tempted to stop short and say no more. Everyone who writes anything in these days of encyclopaedic information, when the world is full of experts on every kind of subject, is of necessity indebted to so many for help that the preface, to do full justice to all, is in danger of becoming as big as the book that follows. Of no other two related subjects is this more true than of Archæology and Criticism. The literature of both fields of research is so voluminous that everyone must avail himself of the guidance given by specialists in many different departments. That I have done so in this case every scholar will know without being told here. I only wish to express my great gratitude for that privilege, without which a work of this kind would not be possible in a whole lifetime.

There is something else for which I am indebted; that spirit of appreciation which disputants only acquire through a wholesome respect for their opponents, for whose wisdom and learning and candor they have the most profound regard. The blessed confraternity of seekers after truth has, I feel, by its precious fellowship, done much for the spirit of this book. If to any it does not yet seem to be all that it ought to be in spirit, then I shall hope to acquire still greater obliga-

tions to my opponents by absorbing more of that spirit from their criticisms of my book.

Despairing of acknowledging by particular mention my debt in these two respects, for materials and for the charitable spirit, there are yet a few names which I must set here in this preface. There is Professor George Frederick Wright of Oberlin, the devout scientist, the profound theologian, the man of letters, the appreciative friend of scholarship everywhere and however antagonistic; to him, perhaps more than to anyone else, I am indebted for whatever I may have acquired of the spirit that loves our literary enemies. One other I must mention with him, one whose views differ most radically from many of my own, Professor George A. Barton of Bryn Mawr, through whom, in a somewhat extended controversial correspondence, I came practically into some good measure of that kindly appreciation of antagonistic scholarship which is one of the joys of life. His criticism of this book will not be mild, but none will be more appreciated.

Turning toward my debt to literary sources, it is still more difficult to make a brief list of those to whom I am especially under obligation, but certainly to none more than to Professor James Orr of Glasgow whose professorial work, which has passed right through nearly all the great critical controversies of the past half century, has enabled him to afford to the world through his books such an index to the literature of Old Testament criticism as is a constant marvel to Bible students. For this I, in common with many others, am much indebted to him; and I owe besides an individual debt of gratitude for the note of Intro-

duction for my book to that public which knows him so well.

Then, Professor William Flinders Petrie, whose readiness to help everybody is a delightful characteristic not too common in the world; to him I am indebted for personal assistance as noted in the pages that follow, and still more for unrestricted access to his valuable archæological library at University College, London. The privilege of many weeks of fellowship in his explorations in Egypt, in the true "oriental atmosphere," has been, also, of inestimable value.

I am very grateful also to Halil Bey, Director of the Imperial Ottoman Museum at Constantinople and to Professor Herrman V. Hilprecht, as Curator of the Babylonian Section, for special facilities afforded me in the examination of the Palestinian antiquities in the museum.

To my friend Professor W. Max Müller of Pennsylvania University I am under obligation for that wide use made of his Egyptological researches which is so manifest in this book, for help afforded on many of the subjects discussed within, and most of all for the stimulus of his marvelously exact scholarship. To still another dear friend, Professor Albert T. Clay of Yale University, my obligation is so apparent in the library references of this book as to require no further mention than that which gratitude compels.

To all these scholars and to many others I extend my thanks, while at the same time I take upon myself to the full the responsibility for all the opinions expressed in the pages that follow.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The exhaustion of the first large edition and the undiminished demand for the book now used in a score of Universities, Colleges, and Theological Seminaries calls for a second edition. The large advances made in discoveries in Bible Lands during the last decade, notwithstanding the world war, together with the urgent desire of some that there should be added the chapters on Canons of Research and Methods of Research make the revision, and substantial enlargement, of the book necessary.

I hope also that this new and enlarged edition may receive the same kind treatment by reviewers and the reading public that was accorded the first edition.

Melvin Grove Kyle.

Xenia Theological Seminary,
Saint Louis, Missouri.

INTRODUCTION

By the Reverend Professor James Orr, D.D.

Few words really are needed to introduce a book which so clearly and ably exhibits its own purpose as that of Dr. Kyle. Oriental Archæology is a subject which has come with such vast strides to the front, has been fraught with such surprises, and now covers so immense a territory, that any book which furnishes an intelligent interpretation of its results is sure of a hearty welcome. Much more is this the case when what is proposed is to illustrate how the new light streaming in from past millenniums in the East affects our estimate of God's holy Word, and our judgment on the keen and relentless, often also most reckless, criticism which has in late years been applied to that Word.

There is need, no doubt, in the case of both assailants and defenders of the Bible of great care and caution in the application of the data supplied by Archæology. Exploration has been amazingly rich in results, but the temptation is great at every step to go beyond the limits of what is actually proved, and to mix up theory and conjecture, and make large and premature deductions from scanty and often ill-understood material. Archæology is not yet an exact science, and while there is happily a large and ever-growing area of undoubtedly established facts, there is also a not inconsiderable margin in regard to which too positive assertion is still hazardous. Everyone who has

tried to follow the course of discovery is painfully aware how much modification of earlier conclusions is found to be necessary with the inevitable increase of knowledge. Add to this the circumstance that even where the facts are not disputed, there is always the possibility of interpreting the same facts differently. As Epictetus said, everything can be laid hold of by two handles, and according to the presuppositions with which the subject is approached, the most opposite conclusions may be drawn from the same apparent premises.

It is a merit of the present book that the author has his eyes wide open to these possibilities of error, and seeks diligently to keep them in view in his own treatment. Just because of the clash of opinions on many points, it becomes the more interesting to try to discover how the advance of knowledge on the whole is affecting the attitude one is justified in taking to the Bible. In the judgment of many—the present writer included—there can be little doubt as to the general answer. The progress of knowledge has not overthrown, but has in innumerable and surprising ways helped to confirm, the view one derives from the Bible itself as to the beginnings of human history, the character of ancient civilizations and the place of the Hebrews in the midst of these, the old family relationships and distributions of mankind, the verisimilitude of the picture of patriarchal conditions, of life in Egypt, in the desert, and in Canaan, of the later history of the kingdoms, and altogether of the course of events as depicted in holy Scripture, in contrast with the violent and hypothetical constructions, based largely

on an *a priori* theory of development, of the modern critical schools. This also is the thesis which Dr. Kyle sets himself with much clearness and success in these pages to establish. In this task he has the advantage of having himself taken part in the work of exploration, and personally visited, and at first-hand had to do with, the places and things he writes about.

It is not necessary, in so wide a field, to agree with every one of Dr. Kyle's conclusions to feel that, over all, he makes out a remarkably strong case, and while firmly upholding conservative conclusions, does so in a moderate and candid spirit towards those opposed to him. His exposition will at least be acknowledged to be always fresh, lucid, and interesting. That his studies have had the result of confirming him in his conviction of the untenableness of the prevailing Wellhausen hypothesis, is hardly surprising in view of the fact that the effect seems to have been the same in the minds of the greater number of archæologists, many of them, as Sayce, Hommel, Naville, Halévy, formerly adherents of that school, but now among its severest critics. Facts seem to be proving too strong for the literary critics, whose schemes are undergoing disintegration in many other ways.

CHAPTER I

The Subject Stated, Defined, and Analyzed

Round about me as I write is the great green circle of the Pocono Mountains of the Blue Ridge range in northeastern Pennsylvania. It is an inclosed basin. From the lookout on Buck Hill nearly every square mile of that basin can be seen, *but nothing beyond.* It may be assumed that the great world without corresponds, in a general way, to this little world within, but one might circle around endlessly within these mountain walls without ever knowing with certainty that it is so; without, indeed, having any means of putting that assumption to the test. *But a way out has been made.* Here the melting ice of some long past glacial period swirled round and round in hopeless effort to escape from this environing mountain ridge. But yonder below, twenty-five miles away, at that strange notch in the horizon, at last some Titanic force of geologic time cleft the rim of this basin with the Delaware Water Gap. Through it an outlet was found to the world beyond. Through it we may pass out from this inclosed basin, and from our never-satisfied curiosity concerning the corresponding world without, to put our theories of that world to the test of observation.

These facts observed in nature may become for us also here and now an allegory. Biblical criticism of the past half-century has been moving in just such an inclosed basin. Eichhorn, the founder of the Higher

Criticism, defined it as "the discovery and verification of the facts regarding the origin, form, and value of literary productions upon the basis of their internal characters."[1] This definition is still adequate for the essential features of the method, though, in its use, it is often combined with the broader historical method that draws much help from external evidence also. The Higher Criticism, then, professedly deals only with internal evidence. But what is internal is inclosed. Thus the Higher Criticism in its essential character is a circumscribed inquiry, and has an incomplete, because inclosed, existence unable to trace its own correspondences. It runs an environed course within an impassable horizon; *i.e., impassable to it.* The first object of its inquiry is the origin of a literature. But the origin of a literature, its author, and the times from which it comes, and all the infinitely varied influences which the times bring to bear upon it, however much they may be *reflected* within the literature, *lie* wholly without it. They make the historical setting, illustrate the imagery, and supply the facts needed to complete the picture. It may be assumed quite properly that what is without does truly correspond to that which is reflected within and may be known correctly by it, if only the correspondences between them be read aright. To read them aright by circling round and round in its inclosed basin is the task the Higher Criticism has set itself. There is no end to this circular path, no way inherent in the method by which it may test decisively its theories formed within the circle of Biblical Literature concerning the facts which lie without. *But a way out has been found,* a

water gap here also. As geology provided for an outlet from this Pocono basin to the environing world beyond, so archæology, the geology of human history, has, by its researches, found an outlet from this inclosed basin of the internal evidences of Biblical Literature, a way out for the examination of the environing circle of times and circumstances. It has thus furnished a convenient and effective way of putting to the final test of actual observation the theories formed within this circle of internal evidence concerning the facts that lie without.

The purpose of this book is to point out this ancient water gap to the old world of human history, this outlet through which criticism may pass out of its inclosed basin of internal evidence to test by observation the correspondence of its theories with the actual facts, the times and circumstances themselves in that surrounding ancient world: then, having pointed out the outlet, it is purposed to lead the reader through it to observe for himself the results of that test.

DEFINITIONS

Archæology is the science of antiquities. One might almost describe it in a popular way as the science of old dead things: dead men of olden times and their dead customs, dead laws, dead institutions, dead empires, dead languages, dead literatures, and dead religions, and in some respects dead art and dead architecture. One thing makes such a description inadequate, this, namely, that *all antiquities are not dead.* Some old things are still alive, have been vital elements in every age, and are still essential in life, literature, and morals

to this day. We write with letters; we set our clock faces staring at the world with their twelvefold marks of division: we try to teach modern life and even modern politics the Ten Commandments. But these things are all antiquities. We must not deny the ancient world its meed of honor, nor refuse the origin of letters to the Phœnicians or to the people from whom they received them, nor our duodecimal computation of time to the Babylonians, nor the Ten Commandments to Moses. So the popular conception of antiquities as old dead things has its limitations. Archæology, the science of antiquities, has to do with some things still very much alive.

But the science that compasses all that is dead and much that still lives extends beyond the compass of a man. Professor Petrie, in his recent *Methods and Aims of Archæology*, has called this science, "The knowledge of how man has acquired his present position and powers,"[1] and adds: "The mass of new material which has been collected, especially in the last fifty years, cannot be mastered by one man, if he is to find time for original work."[2] Thus archæology by its growth has come to be not one science, a specialty, but a whole system of special sciences each with its own territory and a more or less definite horizon; and any discussion of the subject, to be perfectly intelligible, must exactly define its scope.

Archæology, as the science of antiquities, is here to be confined within the Biblical field, a field which has been variously delimited.

De Wette held that "The content of Hebrew archæology extends to that which belongs to the whole state

of the Hebrew nation in its historical manifestation."[1] In his classifications, he has the following: "Sources, Monuments: Literary sources, Class I. The Old Testament. The first and most important source is the Old Testament, which has the advantage of a very careful estimate of the separate writings of the ancients and a stronger appreciation of their historical characters." Others have regarded this field as much narrower. The scope of Biblical archæology most generally recognized in later times is embraced in the threefold division:[2] I. Domestic Antiquities; II. Civil Antiquities; III. Sacred Antiquities. Professor I. M. Price says: "There is still another section to add on the land of Palestine itself."[3]

But since antiquities are not necessarily dead, and since the Bible itself is one of the still living antiquities, Biblical archæology properly includes not only all facts bearing upon the Bible which had been lost and have been found, and all literary remains of antiquity which have brought down to this day information which throws light on Biblical questions, and "another section . . . . on the land of Palestine itself," but also, as of the first importance, this greatest of all antiquities in the world, the Bible itself. There is a widespread tendency in some quarters to leave the Bible out of the list of witnesses, on the ground that *it* is on trial. However plausible this may seem, it is illogical. We might as well rule out the most important part of the earth as a witness in geology, or an old man from telling his own life story, as rule out the Bible from any discussion of Biblical archæology. It has the most to tell and there is no more reliable wit-

ness.[1] Indeed, as "the proper study of mankind is man," and of the geologist, the earth, so the most important study of the Biblical archæologist is the Bible.

Criticism is the art of scrutiny. This definition would the more completely comprehend all that passes under the name of criticism were it said that criticism is the art of scrutiny when it does not descend to unsympathetic inquisitiveness or, worse, into mere faultfinding. When it does so demean itself, it has no boundaries, no horizon. Much of the speculative criticism of the times soars aloft like a balloon, with equal uncertainty of flight; and nobody knows where it will come down, or if ever. If the field of archæological facts is beyond the compass of a man and a lifetime, what shall we say of the boundless flights of speculative criticism?

So criticism is here to be limited in its scope, and mainly, though not exclusively, to the literary criticism of the Bible, now, following Eichhorn, commonly called "the Higher Criticism." But we cannot even yet move on in safety without stopping long enough to state exactly what is to be understood by the Higher Criticism, for the phrase "higher criticism" is as variously used, and its use, without proper definition, as liable to be misunderstood, as the word "evolution." In this discussion we will neither take the toplofty way of those who assume the Higher Criticism to be the sum of all wisdom, nor the imprecatory way of those who proclaim it a "doctrine of devils," but keep to the middle of the plain road marked out by Eichhorn's definition, "the discovery and verification of the facts regarding the origin, form, and value of

literary productions upon the basis of their internal characters."[1] This is the true Higher Criticism. In this, its original and proper signification, it is accepted by all critics as a legitimate and helpful method.

ANALYSIS

Having thus come to an exact understanding of terms, it will be plain that "archæology" and "criticism" in this discussion are meant to designate the bearing of the archæology of Bible lands upon the criticism, especially the Higher Criticism, of the Bible. The subject as thus defined calls for the discussion of:

I. What archæology can do in the case, the powers, rights and authority, that is to say, the *FUNCTION*, of archæology in criticism.

II. What archæology has done in the case, the resulting effects of such archæological evidence, that is to say, the *HISTORY* of the bearing of archæology upon the criticism of the Bible.

III. The present state of the discussion, the Bible in the present light from archæology, that is to say, the *PROGRESS* of archæology in the determining of critical questions.

PART I

FUNCTION

No theory of Biblical criticism is to be finally accepted and made a part of faith and life until tested and attested by archæological facts.

"From the place where the conflagration was first kindled, the firemen keep away. I mean the domain of religious antiquities and dominant religious ideas, that whole region as Vatke in his *Biblical Theology* has marked it out. But only here where the conflict was kindled, can it be brought to a definite conclusion."—Wellhausen.

"In the Wellhausen school, as we have seen, literary criticism of the Old Testament came under the control of the history of religions and institutions: contemporaneously, however, with the development of this school, a new claimant to be heard has put in its voice, in the science of archæology, which bids fair, before long, to control both criticism and history."—Orr.

CHAPTER II

The Historical Setting of Scripture

The function of archæology in criticism has only recently been given much attention. And, as is inevitable on all subjects of importance, and especially where predilections are certain to play so large a part, opinions concerning the value of archæological argument and the cogency of archæological evidence, when applied to the crucial questions of criticism, have varied greatly. Here, as elsewhere, caution generally corresponds to anticipation. Naturally, we approach more readily and rapidly toward supposed friends than suspected enemies, and are less inclined to take account of a new field of investigation that does not promise much to our preconceptions. This is not to cast reflections upon the honesty and candor of all or any schools of criticism, but simply to recognize a very human characteristic. It is altogether probable that the solution of many of our critical and even theological problems would be found in a careful study of ourselves. But explain the phenomena as we will, the fact is, as stated that few have given much attention to the function of archæology in criticism.

Biblical Encyclopædists generally, until the most recent, have not given this subject a place at all. *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Hastings, omits it entirely. Nor can the subject be said to be indirectly introduced, except it be in a very subordinate way in the discussion of other subjects. Indeed, the very word "archæology"

is entirely omitted from the index. The *Encyclopædia Biblica,* Cheyne, has no article on either archæology or antiquities, nor is there anywhere in the work sufficient place given the subject that it should be indexed. The recentness with which the subject of archæology in Biblical criticism has come to the front could have no better illustration than the complete omission from these two great Biblical encyclopædias of any explicit reference to the subject. Such omission was scarcely noticed at the time the works were issued; today it would be inexcusable, if an oversight, and a tacit confession, if intentional. A subject that is engaging the keenest minds of the most radical, as well as the most conservative, critics cannot wisely be ignored.

Turning to other Dictionaries of the Bible, there is found generally the same omission of this subject, except in the most recent works. *Smith's Bible Dictionary;* Kitto, *Encyclopædia of Biblical Literature;* Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopædie;* Eadie, *Biblical Encyclopædia,* have nothing on this subject. McClintock and Strong, *Encyclopædia of Biblical and Ecclesiastical Literature,* has an article on "Biblical Archæology" consisting entirely of Biblical geography, also an article of a general character under the title "Sacred Antiquities." Coming to works of more recent date, the *Catholic Encyclopædia* has an able and comprehensive article on "Biblical Antiquities." *The Jewish Encyclopædia* has also a helpful article of five pages on "Biblical Archæology." The *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia has* an article. But even in these later Bible Dictionaries, where the subject of archæology is presented, it is almost always treated in a general way. On the function of

archæology in criticism, the rights, power and authority of archæology in critical discussion, there is almost nothing, certainly nothing approaching an acknowledgment that archæology is counted upon for very much in the settlement of critical controversies.

But what have the critics to say upon this subject? Since encyclopædias have little or nothing to say on the subject of archæology and criticism, it is to be expected that critics, who are contributors to all the encyclopædias, will have as little to say in their own individual writings. The expectation is not disappointed. Where they have said anything at all on the subject, they have varied much in their estimate of the value of archæology in criticism, according to their individual predilections and the preconceptions of their critical theories; but for the most part, until very recently, archæology has not been given a commanding, or even prominent, place by critics. Most use was made of it formerly by conservative critics, but latterly it has been much used by a few who would be shocked to be so designated.

Wellhausen, it is true, seems to declare, indeed does declare, for the dominance of certain phases of archæology in criticism in the beginning of his *History of Israel* when he says: "From the place where the conflagration was first kindled, the firemen keep away. I mean the domain of religious antiquities and dominant religious ideas, that whole region as Vatke in his *Biblical Theology* has marked it out. But only here where the conflict was kindled, can it be brought to a definite conclusion."[1] But this is one of the canons of criticism which Wellhausen found it convenient, for some reason,

to leave in almost complete desuetude in the development of his brilliant theory.

Driver, in his admirable essay on Hebrew tradition in *Authority and Archæology*, when discussing the value of various kinds of evidence on critical questions, says: "The testimony of archæology sometimes determines the question decisively,"[1] but rather amusingly adds a manifest saving device to the effect that archæological testimony is "often strangely misunderstood," and then hastens to take refuge in his own ark by declaring the defeats of criticism at the hands of archæology often "purely imaginary." It is interesting to note that Driver maintained this same attitude in his *Introduction* in its early editions,[2] seemed to abandon it in later editions, but has now returned to it in the recent seventh edition of Genesis.[3]

Cheyne admits the former disposition of critics to make little use of archæology, especially Assyriology. In his *Bible Problems* he says: "I have no wish to deny that the so-called 'higher critics' in the past were as a rule suspicious of Assyriology as a young, and, as they thought, too self-assertive science, and too sceptical as to the influence of Babylonian culture in relatively early times in Syria, Palestine and even Arabia."[4]

Orr takes the most advanced ground on the value of archæology in criticism, declaring[5] that "archæology bids fair before long to control both criticism and history," and devotes a very comprehensive and cogent chapter in his *Problem of the Old Testament* to the illustration of this advance position.

Eerdmans, successor to Kuenen at Leyden, is not so modest, but boldy assumes that not only "before

long" but *already* archæology does control both criticism and history; for he definitely and absolutely breaks with the Wellhausen School of criticism chiefly on the ground that archæology has discredited their critical viewpoint and made impossible, indeed absurd, the historical atmosphere with which they surround the Old Testament. In stating his views for English readers he says: "It is generally accepted by those who are not bound by dogmatic theories that the main lines of Old Testament criticism may be traced with approximate certainty. I believed so myself for many years, but I no longer hold that opinion." "The Pentateuchal criticism was in every respect a product of Western thought, Western logic, Western combination, which has often forgot that the history of religions and the living Orient were contradictory to the principles of the critical theories." "To sum up in conclusion, I believe that an explanation of the text from the standpoint of the old Israelitic thought will lead to a reformation in Old Testament criticism."[1]

Wiener, one of the most prominent of recent Jewish critics,[2] also believes that the proper apprehension of ancient institutions, customs, documents and codes, *i.e.*, archæology, and especially the archæology of the Bible itself, is clearly decisive in its influence on the issue raised by the Wellhausen School. In his *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism* he says: "In order to understand the Pentateuch, we must so far as possible restore the conditions for which it was in the first instance designed."[3]

Archæologists generally, for a long time, have been putting forth the superior claims of their science in

critical controversy, sometimes with a fanfare to all opponents as they enter the lists, and sometimes with such quiet unobstrusiveness as to escape altogether the attention of the general public.

The great Brugsch,[1] in his *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, without once stepping aside from the rôle of the scientific Egyptologist, yet, in his marshaling of evidence, occupies a large portion of the field of criticism in the early Bible history, and nearly always flies the banner of what has been sometimes contemptuously called traditionalism. Indeed, it is indisputable that most archæologists who have taken the trouble to display critical colors at all have been much inclined to conservatism.

Naville claimed the most exact verification of the Biblical account at Pithom,[2] and interprets the Israel stele[3] of Meremptah in exact accord with the Bible story.

Petrie, in *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*,[4] opens a window that lets in the sunlight upon the dark period of the early Hyksos domination and bids us look upon the illumination of the patriarchal history in Egypt. In his *Researches in Sinai*, bringing to light the strange commingling of Egyptian and Semitic religions characteristic of that borderland, he shows the existence of a genuine natural background for the picture of a well-developed Semitic religion in the heart of the Sinai peninsula both before and after the Exodus period.

Sayce, in his *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, and Hommel, in *Hebrew tradition*, enter the lists for the dominance of archæology in criticism with a challenge to all comers. Hilprecht, in *Explorations in*

Bible Lands, and Clay, in *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, and *Amurru, The Home of the Northern Semites*, make large contributions toward the confirmation of the Scripture narrative, but do not enter so directly into critical controversies.

On the other hand, Spiegelberg, in *Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten*, and Steindorf, in *Explorations in Bible Lands* (Hilprecht), Jeremias, in *Das Alt Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*,[1] Müller, in *Asien und Europa*,[2] and Vincent, in *Canaan d'après l'Exploration Recente*, while accepting the great importance, indeed the deciding character of archæology in critical questions, do not seem to see in it quite so dangerous an adversary to the prevailing critical theories.

Taken all in all, and especially if we put to the one side the archæologists who may be indulged in setting forth in large the importance of their own science, archæology has to the present time been given a quite subordinate place, indeed no permanent seat at all, in critical councils, but has only been called in for special cases when able to give some very important piece of evidence, a kind of critical "special providence" as it were, "a very present help in time of trouble." But these "special providences" have so accumulated, the induction has at last become so large, that the influence of archæology in criticism is beginning to be manifest not as a special providence, but as a general providence; not an incidental element in critical discussions, but a controlling factor.

THE FIRST PART OF THE FUNCTION OF ARCHÆOLOGY IN CRITICISM, as fully brought to light by recent discovery and discussion, IS TO SUPPLY THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF SCRIPTURE.

Archæology furnishes the true historical setting of Scripture, and nothing else does so or can do so. Speculations in a scientist's study some thousands of miles from the scene of action cannot do it. Even if it be granted that history always develops according to the evolutionary hypothesis, still the task is hopeless, for the evolutionary hypothesis only proposes to be anatomical, to furnish the bones of history, while local conditions clothe the frame with flesh and give it a countenance. Nor can traveling and present-day observation of manners and customs supply the historical setting of Scripture, any more than abiding at home by the stuff can elucidate the folklore of one's own community. To do that at home or abroad one must dig below the surface, and determine the relation between present customs and former ones, that is to say, *become an archæologist.*

The importance of exactly so doing in the case of Bible history in order to supply its true historical setting can hardly be overestimated. In art, it is of the utmost importance to hang a picture right before criticism begins. Professor Van Dyke of Princeton has pointed out that the pictures of the Old Masters are misunderstood and often unjustly criticized. They painted their pictures for particular places, under certain lights and shadows, and within special surrounding color schemes: but in modern art galleries their pictures are hung in places greatly different from those for which they were intended, with entirely different arrangement of lights and shadows, and within color surroundings little less than destructive to the painter's ideal. The thing of first importance is *to hang the*

picture right before criticism begins.[1] Art and spirituality have a certain correspondence, not so much in essence as in the conditions necessary for appreciation. The patriarchs and prophets and psalmists are the Old Masters of spirituality. Their productions were for certain situations in life, produced under certain social, political, moral, and religious lights and shadows and within a certain surrounding color scheme of influence, enemies, opportunities, temptations, and spiritual privileges. Now, not to mention the homilists of all ages, *the critics especially and very flagrantly* have hung the pictures of these Old Masters of spirituality in the cloistered seclusion of German and English and American professorial studies and lecture rooms, under the lights and shadows of modern extravagantly artificial life, surrounded by a color scheme of materialistic philosophy, in an age of speculation, under the charm of subjectivity and the license of defective logic. The result is the radical criticism of the day.

It is here also of the utmost importance to hang the picture right before criticism begins. Put these Old Masters in their intended place, under the soft lights and shadows of Oriental life, surrounded by that color scheme of morals, religion, and philosophy for which they were prepared, and criticism may take on an entirely different complexion. It is only archæology which supplies, or can supply, this historical setting. The critic who ignores archæology is like a chemist as curator of an art gallery, able to analyze everything into its constituent elements and to eliminate every speck of impurity, but who, if he does so, at the same time also destroys all the pictures.

CHAPTER III

Guidance to the Methods of Criticism

A second part of the function of archæology in criticism is to give guidance to its methods. Certainly criticism ought to make use of all the guidance available, since it is a fundamental assumption of every distinct school of criticism, repudiating as it must, in order to be distinct, the work of every other school, that it surveys a vague and trackless territory. Now archæology is to Biblical criticism, in this its self-appointed task, what ancient geographers and travelers are to studies in classical history and literature, and much more as its scope is much broader. Archæology, it is true, is not complete in all its details, and neither is the work of the ancient geographers and travelers, but it gives a general guidance to methods of research as they do to classical studies.

I. Concerning Presuppositions

Archæology gives this guidance concerning the *presuppositions* of criticism. He who prates about an unbiased mind and warns against every one who has any opinions—especially opinions which have been formulated and given out in such way that the world may call them a creed—as incapable of making trustworthy investigations, writes himself down a suspicious character and sets every person with a proper amount of caution on the watch against him for some especially exaggerated form of mental strabismus. For presup-

positions are inevitable from our mental constitution, which will not allow us to consider anything in isolation, but always in relation to other things, and so compels us in our processes of thought always to proceed from one thing to another. So, all thinking being thus interrelated, presuppositions are necessary to the consideration of any subject, since all subjects cannot be considered at once.

Presuppositions, and many of them, all critics of every school have. All that can be done in the matter is to take care that the presuppositions be correct. But our presuppositions are naturally, to a very large extent, those induced by our experience and environment until we are otherwise instructed. As only archæology is able to instruct us concerning the exact circumstances of that portion of the Word which may at any time be under discussion, it is evident that without the instruction which archæology gives we cannot be assured of correct presuppositions in the critic. It is indisputable that archæologists tend to closer and closer agreement in criticism, just as residents differ less concerning local customs and influences than do foreigners who write so confidently about them. The thorough archæologist becomes a resident of antiquity, while all other critics are foreigners.

II. CONCERNING THE CANONS OF CRITICISM

Archæology gives guidance also concerning the *canons* of criticism. The canons of criticism of any literature must be learned from the literature of the same age and, as nearly as possible, of the same people. It seems almost incredible that in this literary age, the

most prolific and certainly not the least critical in the whole course of human history, it should be necessary to point out this common-sense principle. Yet the failure to take proper account of it is the astonishing, yet well-sustained, indictment brought by Eerdmans in his arraignment of the whole course of Old Testament criticism in Germany.

The extensive literary remains of Egypt and Babylonia reveal literary methods and standards very different from each other and still more different from those of modern Western literature, but exhibiting to a marked degree the literary peculiarities of the Old Testament. In Babylonian literature much attention is paid to epochal chronology, in Egyptian literature comparatively little attention is given to chronology at all, and what chronology there is is seldom epochal, but is either synchronistic or merely annalistic; while in the Old Testament, there is a mingling of more or less of all these kinds of chronology, as Palestine was ever from her earliest history a field where Babylonian and Egyptian thoughts and customs commingled with those indigenous to Palestine and Syria.

Again, in Babylonian literature there are carefulness and some good degree of accuracy; in Egyptian literature, carelessness, slovenliness and inaccuracy are provokingly frequent. The Scriptures of the Old Testament are, indeed, in these respects, in striking contrast with these other literatures. There is a more rigid conscientiousness in writing and in copying and in the pruning away of the boastful hyperbole of the Orient, to call it by no harsher name. Yet nowhere in ancient Oriental literature, either in the Bible or out of it, is

there the mathematical rigidity of statement demanded by Occidental literature of today; while there is frequently brevity of statement and abruptness of literary method which, to Western minds, under the influence of Western literary canons, appear to be fragmentariness of documents.

It would be foolish and disastrous to judge Western literature by these Oriental peculiarities—to compare Guyot with Strabo; Macaulay with Herodotus; Humboldt with Berosus; Tennyson's "Charge of the Light Brigade" with Pentaur's heroic account of Rameses' charge against the Hittite host; or Faber's "Hymns" with the "Songs of Solomon." Equally unscientific and disastrous, may we not say absurd, has been the effort to judge Oriental writings by Western standards.

III. CONCERNING THE VALUE AND INFLUENCE OF LITERARY FORM

Archæology gives guidance to criticism in estimating the *value and influence of the literary form* in which ancient documents and other literary remains have come down to us. As already intimated, there is often an apparent fragmentariness and lack of unity in ancient literary remains. A collection of even well-preserved papyri presents the appearance of scraps. A group of cuneiform tablets, however regular they may be in size and shape and form, has yet an appearance of physical separateness, in its parts, which is suggestive of fragmentariness. This characteristic of ancient literature exerts an insidious influence upon a modern student against which it is not easy to contend successfully, and the more so that some do not seem even to be aware of it.

We can the better understand the problem when we stop to consider how much of the so apparent definiteness and unity of modern literature is due, and still more our perception of it is due, to the very modern arts of printing and bookbinding. How very different was the "copy" for this same modern literature when it came into the hands of the printer: and before the days of the typewriter, the condition of the "copy" was still worse. But even the best and neatest manuscript, prepared as it is on separate sheets, presents no such appearance of unity and integrity and makes no such impression of clearness and definiteness as the same production when it comes from the modern printing establishment. What with beautiful title-page and headings, with chapters, paragraphs, and numbered sections, to say nothing of punctuation marks, of which the ancients knew almost nothing, what with half-tone cuts, side notes and foot notes, indexes and appendices, it is no exaggeration to say that one-half of the literary cogency of many books is supplied thus by the publisher. How many books in their original manuscript form could never get anybody to read them except the author and the printer!

Now, accustomed, as we are, to receive all our literature in the most attractive, alluring, and helpful form in which modern books are presented to us, when we turn to examine a literature lacking the assistance of the art of the printer and the bookbinder, we find it very difficult to allow properly for the difference; indeed, very few critics succeed in doing so, but attack this appearance of indefiniteness and fragmentariness, or scent at once indications of a compilation by some

clumsy redactor. Even when ancient literature is given a modern publication, these misleading appearances still largely remain, for it was not prepared for such publication, but for the ancient form, and a literal presentation of it retains most of its characteristics.

But archæology makes very plain the meaning of all these peculiarities in form in ancient Oriental literatures and the causes of them. The antiquarian collects fragments of tablets and painstakingly fits them together, gathers out of the rubbish heaps of the ruins of a millennium the disheveled parts of papyrus or parchment and pieces together the torn and scattered fragments, or even finds a carefully preserved library, which yet is made up of what is to us, of modern days, only a collection of loose leaves, without chapters, with little or no punctuation, without paragraphing or numbering of pages, without indexes or appendices, without the title of the manuscript at the beginning or the name of the author at the end. Thus the archæologist realizes at once how much the absence of the modern literary helps in form contributes to the appearance of fragmentariness, and how much the critic needs to perceive the same and to take account of it and to allow sufficiently for it, if he is to be a trustworthy critic.

So archæology makes very clear that apparent fragmentariness and indefiniteness in Oriental literature, either profane or sacred, in so far as it arises from literary form, or the absence of literary form, and not from partial destruction of documents, *in no wise militates against its integrity.*

IV. CONCERNING THE INTERPRETATION OF ANCIENT LITERATURE

Still again archæology gives guidance to the methods of criticism concerning the *interpretation* of ancient literature.

Archæology must needs remind us, and often, of the truism, so much overlooked, that a language and literature means only what it is understood to mean by those from whom it comes. No one will permit even the wisest man in the world to force upon his words a meaning other than he intended. Even judges of the courts, who are the greatest sticklers for the force of phraseology, yet permit historical inquiry as to the exact intent of the framers of a law. It is to the credit of this age that we account ridiculous the practice of a certain class of homilists of a half-century ago, who took up their hearers' time with the presentation of all possible interpretations of a passage of Scripture; yet we have not gotten beyond the pugilistic method of trying to thrust down the throat of an opponent in political, or theological, or critical controversy some meaning of his words which it is possible to extract from them or impose upon them, but which he vehemently repudiates: and it passes comprehension that this critical age should yet tolerate in Biblical criticism almost without protest the etymological, the analytical, and especially the speculative method of interpretation, that devises a theory and constructs and reconstructs an interpretation in accordance with the same and insists that this interpretation is what the author must mean to say.

Against this all but universal method of present-day criticism, one voice is vehemently raised, the voice of archæology. The primary and essential characteristic of this science cries out aganst such a method. Archæology seeks to find out things *as they were* and not *as they ought to have been according to any theory.* The archæological method, which is also the only true historical method, is *to find out what happened* and then construct a record of the known events. It is for this reason that archæologists, as such, almost with one consent look askance at criticsm as vague and not above suspicion. The etymological, analytical, and speculative methods of criticism are helpful, they afford means and supply implements, but in order to be reliable, they must have the support of the historical method, which, in the case of Biblical criticism, is archæology. In the absence of this support, and more especially if contemporary history, as revealed by archæology, be antagonistic, interpretation, though supported by all the other methods of criticism, is exceedingly precarious.

The interpretation of a rubric by the etymological, analytical, and speculative methods of criticism may be completely overthrown by a single picture, or a brief description of the priest at the altar, or especially by the discovery of an ancient place of worship. It was formerly assumed without question that Egypt with her many great altars and her multitude of great sacrifices had a system of great holocausts, but the discovery of the alabaster altar of the Vth dynasty at Abu Gurab, the beautiful granite altar of Usertsen II at Lisht, and the artistic white limestone altar of

Hatasu of the XVIIIth dynasty at Deir el-Bahri with not a trace of fire upon any of them, or the slightest evidence of wear or calcining that would indicate that they had ever been used for burnt offering, makes the assumption of the great holocaust as a regular part of ancient Egyptian worship an exceedingly improbable one.

The Bible abounds in allusions to the high places and the worship conducted at them. "Ye shall utterly destroy all the places, wherein the nations which ye shall possess served their gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree: and ye shall overthrow their altars, and break down their pillars, and burn their groves with fire and ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the names of them out of that place."[1] "And he made an house of high places, and made priests of the lowest of the people, which were not of the sons of Levi."[2] "The Lord said also unto me in the days of Josiah the king, Hast thou seen that which back-sliding Israel hath done? She is gone up upon every high mountain and under every green tree, and there hath played the harlot."[3] Until very recently, commentators have had little recourse but to get what they could from Hebrew etymology and make as much as possible out of speculations concerning the character of the "groves" and the nature of the religious orgies held at the high places. It is now not a little disquieting to compare their well-meant explanations with the picture of worship at an ancient Semitic high place found by de Morgan at Susa[4] or the ruins of an actual high place found at Gezer by Macalister,[5] or the

well-preserved high place at Petra discovered by Robinson.[1]

The ancients have a right to their own interpretation of what they said and archæology must guide to that interpretation. It is the great commentary on ancient literature, whether that which has just been dug up, as the recent finds of manuscripts and monuments, or that which has never been lost, as the Bible itself.

CHAPTER IV

Archæological Facts with Which to Test Critical Theories

In the discussion of the function of archæology in criticism, of which two parts, THE HISTORICAL SETTING and the GUIDANCE OF METHODS, have been discussed in preceding chapters, we come now to the third and last, and in all respects the most important part which is TO PROVIDE FACTS WITH WHICH TO TEST CRITICAL THEORIES.

Archæology supplies facts with which to test the theories of criticism. The simple statement of this part of the function of archæology in criticism makes instantly apparent its far-reaching importance. The other parts of the function of archæology in criticism which have already been mentioned, the furnishing of the true historical setting, and the guidance of methods concerning presuppositions, canons, literary form, and interpretation, are but preliminary and contributory, the function of *service;* but the supplying of facts with which to test theories is final and dominant, the function of *control.* Wherever archæology has something definite to say, it claims the right to the last word. If it, as yet, only "bids fair to control criticism," it boldly claims its *right* to control it now. Here is heard the deciding voice of the monuments in Biblical criticism.

Let us see upon how good ground archæology makes this claim. It will be admitted—it is admitted—that

there can be no real antagonism between the facts of archæology and a correct criticism of trustworthy documents. This is not to say that there can be no antagonism between facts and truth in its broadest sense. There may be many things done, *i.e.*, *facts*, which are against the truth. All the existence of evil in the world attests that. But there can be no antagonism between facts and truth in the same field of thought, between the facts and the truth concerning the facts. There may be the most positive antagonism between moral truth and human conduct, but there can be no antagonism between the truth about the conduct of a certain person and the facts of his conduct; or between the truth about many persons, *i.e.*, history and the facts of history; or between the truth about many statements of human thought and all the circumstances of those statements, *i.e.*, literary criticism, and the material facts concerning the records, *i.e.*, archæology. Critics and archæologists seem to agree perfectly in the statement that there can be no antagonism between a correct literary criticism of trustworthy documents and the facts of archæology. But it is, after all, a very ambiguous agreement, for archæologists mean, "You are certain in the end to come around to our way of thinking;" and the critics mean, "*You* are certain in the end, when you get all the pieces put together, to reach the same conclusions that we have anticipated." Who or where is the umpire? Who or what is to determine when the criticism is "a correct criticism"? When there is conflict between the facts of archæology and the conclusions of criticism, which is to give way?

To ask this question is to answer it. Theory must always give way to fact. In the settlement of disputes, facts are final. Even so staunch a defender of the rights and function of criticism as Dr. Driver, recognized this principle, *at least in theory*. For he says: "Where the testimony of archæology is direct, it is of the highest possible value, and, as a rule, determines the question decisively: even where it is indirect, if it is sufficiently circumstantial and precise, it makes a settlement highly probable."[1]

This prerogative of archæological facts in the testing of critical theories, is evidently far-reaching in its powers and must of necessity be given wide and positive recognition. It is now to be scrutinized with the utmost care.

The several rules, or canons, of this criticism of criticism are inseparably linked together.

I. NO THEORY TO BE ACCEPTED UNTIL TESTED BY FACTS

No theory is to be finally accepted and made applicable to one's faith and life until it is tested and attested by facts. If it is in the field of experience, by facts of experience. If in the field of history, by the facts of history. And the Master commends even revelation to this test when He says: "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God or whether I speak from myself."

Anything in the Bible may be discredited by theory. Everything in heaven and earth may be, indeed has been, discredited by theory. More, there can be no accepted realities in all the universe of existence, phenomena, and experience, if theory is allowed to

stand unsupported by fact, permitted, undisputed, to dominate the intellect and faith of a man and so ultimately to direct his life. One might as safely abandon the beaten track for the most alluring but unconfirmed appearance upon the horizon of the Eastern desert, as turn one's life aside to a theory unattested by facts; however perfect the appearance, it may after all be only the mirage and the disappointed pilgrim may never again get back to the safe road. Let theory first be confirmed by fact, then it may be received into life.

II. NO THEORY CORRECT SIMPLY BECAUSE IT WORKS

But a theory which meets all the known conditions of the case in hand is not by that fact proved to be true, and therefore to be received into the life. And the most alluring danger to which criticism is subject is the assumption of the contrary opinion, namely, that a theory which meets all the known conditions of the case in hand is by that fact proved to be true. This is not the case. Such a theory must, in addition, be corroborated by independent evidence, either the bringing to light of the expected facts or demonstration of the power of the theory to unlock mysteries. And even if mysteries be unlocked, the theory is not necessarily an entirely correct theory. The key that turns the lock must be something like the key that belongs to it, but may, after all, be a false key. There must be, in any case, whether of mysteries unlocked or of facts brought to light, independent, genuine evidence in addition to the adaptability of the theory to all the known conditions of the case in hand. Furthermore,

a theory must not only be able to meet the test of some additional facts but the test of all the conditions imposed by any additional facts brought to light, and be able, also, to incorporate these new facts as naturally as those upon which the theory was originally constructed. This is the final and conclusive test, without meeting which no theory is to be received into life.

That a theory which meets all the conditions of the case in hand is by that fact proved to be true is a mathematical dictum. Mathematics belongs to the domain of pure, absolute, and universal truth and there this dictum holds good. A theory which meets all the conditions of the case there furnishes one solution of the problem in hand, of which there may be other, sometimes several, correct solutions. But mathematical dicta are not always true in life and literature and especially not in history, which, in its unwritten form, is but the complex of life and, in its written form, the union of life with literature. Life, literature, and history do not lie within the domain of universal truth, the domain of all possibilities, but in the realm of actualities, and all possibilities have not become actualities. Indeed, most things have never been done.

For in life, literature, and history there enters a new and most potent element, human volition, which chooses among all the possibilities one only in each case to become the actuality in the event. So that here there are not several possible solutions of the problem of the event, but one only and that the right one. All other proposed solutions are false, however well they provide for the event, and even if they provide for it better than the real solution of the problem, for

people do not always do things in the best or even the easiest way. The problem, indeed, in life, literature, and history is not to determine possibilities, but an actuality, not one or several of the ways in which an event might have taken place, nor even the way in which it might best have taken place, but the way in which it did take place.

A theory which meets all the conditions of the case in hand may be one of the several ways in which the event might have taken place, and yet it may be that it did not take place in that way at all; and only by independent, genuine corroborative evidence is any theory to be attested as the way in which the event actually did take place.

1. That this statement of the case is correct in the experiences of *life*, we have abundant evidence in the proceedings of courts of law. Here judge and jury are not interested in discovering the many ways in which an event may have taken place or the many persons who may have done a deed, but only the one way in which it was done and the person who did it. It is the many possibilities that never became actualities that constitute the whole field for detective work, and occasion most of the labors of judge and jury. If there were only one way for an event to take place; *i.e.*, if every theory which meets the conditions of the case in hand were the correct theory, there would be nothing for detectives to do and the function of courts would be declarative, whereas in reality the chief function of the courts is to determine that one possibility which became the actuality in the case. But the most painstaking procedure does not wholly prevent false

convictions. The prosecutor presents a theory of the commission of a crime, which meets all the conditions of the case as made out by the evidence in his possession, convinces twelve jurymen, and secures a conviction. Yet sometimes afterward it is found out that another person committed the crime in an entirely different way. A case which interested two continents is that of Andrew Toth, who was released from the Western Penitentiary, of Pennsylvania, after serving twenty years on a life sentence for murder, his release being brought about by the death-bed confession of a man in Austria.

2. That the mathematical dictum under consideration is inapplicable to *literature* is equally well established. Sir Peter le Page Renouf argued with great acuteness and force that it is possible to assign significations to an unknown script, give meanings to the words thus formed, construct a grammar, and translate inscriptions as historical statements and make good sense, though not a single sign or word or construction or thought be correct.[1] He says, indeed: "It is not difficult to make out the Ten Commandments, the Psalms of David, the Homeric poems, or the Irish melodies, on any ancient or modern monument whatever, and in any language you please." Not that it is not possible to avoid this, but that it is possible to do it, if the proper precautions are not taken.

It is easy to see the truth of this contention in the case of unknown numerals. A dozen persons may each assign values to such numerals and, with such assigned values, may add, subtract, multiply, and divide correctly in method, though not a single assignment of

value be correct and the assignments of no two of the dozen be alike. This danger, so apparent in the case of numerals, which are, in fact, word signs, is always present and to be reckoned with in the decipherment and interpretation of hieroglyphic writings. Actual examples of the fulfillment of Renouf's warning thesis are not wanting in the history of the decipherment of unknown tongues. The grotesque, yet confident, efforts at the decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphs before the discovery of the Rosetta stone which supplied the true key are not forgotten. Indeed, it is to be hoped that they will always be remembered to stimulate caution in future decipherers of unknown tongues.

Budge says: "In more modern times, the first writer, at any length, on hieroglyphs was Athanasius Kircher, the author of some ponderous works in which he pretended to have found the key to the hieroglyphic inscriptions and to translate them. Though a man of great learning, it must be said that, judged by scholars of today, he would be considered an impostor."[1] Joseph de Guines (1770) maintained that China was settled by Egyptians, and the Chinese characters only degenerate Egyptian hieroglyphs.[2]

Similar failures in the attempt to decipher the Hittite hieroglyphs and translate the Hittite inscriptions must form painful recollections to some distinguished scholars yet living, whose efforts, extending in some cases not only to lists of signs, but to syllabaries, vocabularies, grammars, and translations, are now, in part, and in some cases, *in toto*, rejected by the whole learned world. However successful present or future efforts of these distinguished scholars may prove to

be, they have, in part at least, themselves repudiated their former work.

It must be admitted, of course, that a hieroglyphic literature presents the most and the greatest difficulties of interpretation, and most surely presents them; and there these dangers of fatal mistake are greatest. But another fact is not easily recognized, is, indeed, too often overlooked altogether; this, namely, that a language not hieroglyphic and a literature in a known tongue presents difficulties which differ from these mentioned only in degree and in the form of embodiment, and not at all in the essential quality of the danger involved. Since a literature means only what it was intended to mean by those from whom it comes, whatever it may be that in any degree obscures that intention, whether method of writing, peculiarities of expression, or references to topography, history, and manners and customs, it always presents that one and the same problem which the element of human volition interjects, the problem of determining which of all possible meanings was chosen as the intention of the author. So that, in any case, the historical method, and only the historical method, can speak the last word in criticism. But the historical method in all ancient literature, whether sacred or profane, becomes the archæological method.

The most plausible theory of a literature, though it seem to embrace every detail and meet every condition imposed, even though *it actually does so*, may after all be found to be, as in one or two attempts at the decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions, wholly false when tested by the facts of contemporary history and

by the principles of comparative philology, which are themselves but some of the universal facts of human experience.

3. Now the dangers of unconfirmed theory in life and in literature are added together in *history*, which, in its final form, is but life written down, human experience given over to all the infinitely varied conventionalities of literature. Here it is doubly important that no theory be given final acceptance and made a part of one's mental furniture and allowed to influence one's attitude and conduct in life, until it is tested and attested by facts. Surely the warnings of the study of Egyptian and classical history and literature are not to be disregarded. Menes and other early kings of Egypt were declared by criticism to be mere mythological characters; Minos of Crete was relegated to the same limbo; and the stories of Troy and her heroes were said to belong to "cloudland." How recently was all this included in the universal opinion of criticism. And what generations, even centuries, of learned critical scrutiny lay back of this opinion in justification of it! Has the label, "myth," which criticism has fastened to anything in sacred or classical story, more or better critical argument to support it than had the opinion that these kings and heroes were only the creatures of a romancing fancy? Yet the spade of Petrie[1] at Abydos, of Evans[2] at Knossos, and of Schliemann[3] at Troy has revealed the "cloudland" as solid earth and shown the ghostly heroes to have been substantial men of flesh and blood.

If we are to learn anything from experience, if reason has anything to do with human guidance, then cer-

tainly no theory of either sacred or profane history of ancient times is to be finally accepted as correct until tested and attested by facts. If human intellect is not to hold the pilot wheel at the passing of these little known and dangerous straits, then we may well ask, When is it ever to guide thought and investigation?

III. ONLY ARCHÆOLOGY IS BRINGING FORTH ANY NEW FACTS ON THE QUESTIONS RAISED BY CRITICISM

But whence are to come the facts with which to test critical theories? Only archæology is bringing forth any new facts on the questions raised by Biblical criticism, the very raising of which is a kind of dissent from the authority or the sufficiency of the known or seeming facts.

Criticism produces only theories; it combines facts, but produces none. Theories are only thoughts. The mind in its thinking produces no facts except for the one subject of psychology. Even so patent a truth needs to be stated at the present time and in the present temper and attitude of criticism. One might even be pardoned for sometimes fancying that some critics sometimes think that in their thinking they think facts.

Then the exegetes and commentators rarely, if ever now, bring to light new facts, any more than present-day philosophers give to the world new thoughts or our poets-laureate drape their muse in new imagery. A flood of light is, indeed, pouring across the page of the exegete and the commentator and the critic in these latter days which makes their work inestimably more helpful for interpretation, but the source of that light is neither criticism nor exegesis nor comment, but

archæology. Archæology it is that sets around Bible history the facts of its environment, which facts illustrate Bible literature and literary methods by the literature of the times and the methods of its own literati, which make the purity and the sanctity and the divinity of all the things of revelation stand out in their own glorious light by putting back of them the shadows of contemporary ritual and morality and superstition, and which thus put to the test of actual observation the teachings of exegesis, comment, and criticism.

These, then, are the facts with which to test critical theories and they have no other source. Hence no critical theory concerning the Bible is to be finally accepted and admitted into the faith and life until tested and attested by archæological facts.

The function of archæology in criticism as thus brought out has been glimpsed here and there by Bible students in various departments of investigation far back in the history of modern learning and all along to the present time without being permitted to exert permanent or serious influence upon its course or methods. Even Wellhausen, than whom no one has made more use of the unsupported critical method or relied more upon it, yet lays down as fundamental the authority of some portions of archæology in criticism in the famous passage already quoted[1] from the beginning of his *History of Israel*[2] in which he remands the final determination of the whole critical discussion to the "domain of religious antiquities and dominant religious ideas." And the distinguished Scottish professor of this generation, George Adam Smith, also quotes[3] with approval these words from Napoleon:

"When camping upon the ruins of ancient cities, some one read the Bible aloud every evening in the tent of the General-in-Chief. The verisimilitude and truthfulness of the descriptions were striking. They are still suited to the land after so many ages and vicissitudes."[1] But Professor Smith in a depreciatory way adds: "This is not more than true, yet it does not carry us very far." "All that geography can do is to show whether or not the situations were possible at the time to which they are assigned, and even this is a task often beyond her resources." In this comment he strangely minimizes all three of the essential marks of trustworthy evidence,—the time, the place, and the circumstances. For the "time" he distinctly mentions in his criticism, the place is required for the "situations," and the circumstances are needed to make the situation" "possible." It is strange, indeed, that these necessary and usually sufficient marks of trustworthy evidence should thus be so lightly cast aside in criticism, as though of little importance.

These two utterances of distinguished criticis represent very well the attitude of criticism toward the function of archæology in critical discussions. While critics here and there have acknowledged its proper function, they have not heretofore allowed it much scope for the exercise of that function.

PART II

HISTORY

Extravagant claims concerning the outcome of the testing of critical theories by archæological facts have been made both by some critics and by some of their opponents; and besides, there is much archæological evidence which is neutral in the controversy. But, as far as the process of testing critical theories of the Bible by archæological facts has been carried to the present time, archæology is bringing criticism into harmony with Scripture at its face value, and is not definitely and unequivocally encouraging attempts at literary reconstruction of any portion of the Bible, though sometimes asked to render such service.

"On all other points [than where evidence is neutral] the facts of archæology, so far as they are at present known, harmonize entirely with the positions generally adopted by critics."—Driver.

"The idea still prevalent in some quarters, that archæology has overthrown many of the conclusions of literary and historical criticism, has been based simply on a misconception of the facts."—Stanley A. Cook.

"It remains true, that, so far as the Old Testament scholarship is concerned, it [archæology] has not confirmed a single position doubted by sober criticism."—A. S. Peake.

The great and ultimate hope which shines over all the darkness and confusion of controversy is the all but universal sincerity of purpose and effort to find the truth. Sooner or later it will be found by all. The needle may be disturbed by many things, but at last will come back to the true course. However much fallacies may influence thinking for a long time, logic, which is but the academic name for common sense, is certain to prevail in the end, and the "Spirit will lead into all truth."

CHAPTER V

Theories not Affecting the Historicity or Integrity of Scripture

The editor of one of our American religious weeklies, a gentleman of varied learning and an ardent supporter of the current Wellhausen criticism, when allusion was made in conversation to the former opinion concerning the ignorance of the patriarchal age, indignantly protested that no such opinion had ever been held by critics, and so criticism, at this point, had never been corrected by archæology. Here was an astonishing situation, to say the least. On the one hand, his honesty and sincerity did not seem to be open to question; on the other hand, such ignorance of the history of archæology in criticism on the part of one so deeply interested in the subject seemed incredible, or let us say incomprehensible. But observation compels the conclusion that such ignorance is very general; that, in fact, the history of archæology in criticism is very much in need of an historian, and that nothing would clarify the critical situation more than a clear and comprehensive view of the part which archæology has thus far had in changing the claims and even the course of criticism.

The scope of this discussion does not admit of an aim so ambitious as would be such a history for general purposes, but only the presentation of so much of that history as will serve the specific purpose of the discussion, the vindication of the importance of archæology in criticism.

The history of archæology in criticism to be set forth here is mainly the history of the testing of critical theories by archæological facts. The story of the furnishing of the historical setting of Scripture would be the account of the archæological identification of peoples, places, and events, of manners, customs, and institutions in Bible lands during the past one hundred years, one of the most fascinating of the stories of modern research, and sufficient of itself to extend to many volumes. Indeed, the mere statement of results without acknowledging their source or discussing their bearing upon criticism, constitutes a large part of every present-day encyclopædia of Biblical knowledge. Its value to criticism cannot be overestimated, but to present this historical setting here and make application of it in detail would be to take up the whole critical discussion itself, whereas the purpose is only to illustrate the way of putting criticism to a final and conclusive test. The history of the guiding of critical methods by archæological information is in the making. There can hardly as yet be said to be any to record. Critics have not been inclined to this time to allow archæological facts to give much guidance to their methods.

When we turn to the history of the testing of critical theories by the results of archæological research, we find the process of that testing to be so varied and extended that it would make a large book of itself. Only an outline of it can be given here to illustrate the method and its results. An outline, however, will be quite adequate to the purpose, and sufficient will be given to warrant an independent judgment of the value of this kind of evidence in criticism.

Extravagant claims concerning the outcome of the testing of critical theories by archæological facts have been made both by some of the critics and by some of their opponents. Driver says: "Now while, as need hardly be said, there are many points on which, as between what may be termed the traditional and the critical views of the Old Testament the verdict of archæology is neutral, on all other points the facts of archæology, so far as they are at present known, harmonize entirely with the positions generally adopted by critics."[1]

On the other hand, the astronomer Piazzi Smith thought that the great pyramid proved the "wisdom of the Egyptians" to have included some of the abstruse problems of astronomy; and Dr. Seiss, in his *Miracle in Stone*, was confident that the same colossal monument definitely portrayed some of the extreme positions of the premillennial theology! Quoting the words of Paul, "The dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air"; he adds, "Such revealed facts as to one outcome from the dispensation that now is, would call for just such an arrangement of symbols in Egypt as we find in this top outlet from the Pyramid Grand Gallery."[2]

Some instances of the testing of critical theories of the Old Testament by the facts of archæology are here to be presented, those only being selected the historical proof of which cannot be questioned, no matter what may be one's critical views or how much those views may be antagonized by the result of the tests. We will FIRST CONSIDER THE THEORIES NOT AFFECTING THE HISTORICITY OR INTEGRITY OF SCRIPTURE.

Many critical theories, notably those not affecting the historicity or the integrity of Scripture, *i.e.*, accordant with the face value of Scripture, have been corroborated, and others have been discredited, by archæological research.

I. THEORIES CORROBORATED

A few only of the large number corroborated will be mentioned. Foremost among these may be placed, in the order of their importance, the three handmaids of history, geography, ethnology, and chronology, the most important of all archæological evidence, yet the most neglected by criticism. After these, some less important, though better recognized, items of evidence will be presented.

1. Of the many theories underlying criticism, and interpretation as well, none has received more abundant and exact and even startling corroboration than the theory of *the geographical and topographical trustworthiness of Scripture.* It is the all but universal assumption that the peoples, places, and events of Scripture would be found just where Scripture locates them; and that every description, or even casual hint, concerning locality or landscape is correct—not the imaginings of mere romancers, as Homer's account of the travels of Ulysses; not attempted adaptations, as the Egyptian romances of Ebers or the medieval descriptions by Marion Crawford or the more classical Palestine descriptions of Tasso in *Jerusalem Taken;* not even conventional delineations which, like the historical novel of today, aim only at correctness in some things and adapt others to the exigencies of fiction, but exact representations of realities.

Attempts have been made to belittle the importance of this assumed geographical and topographical trustworthiness of Scripture. George Adam Smith says: "Many legends are wonderful photographs of scenery. And, therefore, let us at once admit that, while we may have other reasons for the truth of the patriarchal narratives, we cannot prove this on the ground that their itineraries and place-names are correct."[1] Driver says, in commenting upon this, that "it is for this reason that exploration in Palestine, valuable and interesting as its results have been, has contributed but little towards solving the great historical problems which the Old Testament presents."[2] More significant than the positive utterances of any of those critics who give much attention to archæological evidence of a geographical and topographical character is the general disposition of critics to ignore this kind of evidence altogether. It may be safely assumed that what is accessible to all the critics and is by them considered useful will be used. They do not use this.

But all attempts to belittle the importance of the geographical and topographical indications and allusions given in Scripture, whether by ignoring them or by making light of them, are beside the mark. Correctness concerning the place of an event is the first and most important mark of a true narrative of real happenings, and the confirmation of such correctness in the Scripture is the first step toward the confirmation of Scripture; just as the discrediting of the statements concerning the place of an event makes unnecessary any further efforts to discredit a narrative of this event; and the incorrectness of any statement of place

in Scripture would discredit that portion of Scripture. The principle underlying the proving of an alibi is fatal always and everywhere. It may be readily granted that revelation in the form of allegory, parable, or vision might have imaginary scenery. But the problem of such Biblical literature is not the one presented to us in the critical controversies of the present time, and argument along that line is wasted effort. Critical controversies do not concern manifest allegory but that which claims to be history. The problem is not of the geographical and topographical untrustworthiness of imaginative scripture that does not exist, but of the trustworthiness of historical scripture which we have in hand. Any attempt to belittle the importance of the place names in such literature is to belittle the importance of history itself, which cannot exist aside from known places.

The theory of the geographical and topographical trustworthiness of Scripture has been, and is, of well-nigh universal acceptance. Exegesis almost always allows the assumption of the trustworthiness of the Scripture indications of places and persons to have weight in the making up of its conclusions. Discussion, even between the most antagonistic scholars, has usually proceeded upon the common assumption of the correctness of this theory. And in accordance with it, archæologists have fitted out extensive expeditions, have made long and arduous and dangerous journeys, have bought or leased expensive tracts of land and paid well for the rights and privileges of research, have made their measurements and completed their excavations, and, also, it is hardly necessary to say, have had their

expectations rewarded with complete fulfillment and their confidence with complete vindication. The correctness of geographical and topographical notes and notices in Scripture has been established. The whole body of identifications in Bible lands attest this theory and the whole list of sacred geographies, uniform in every essential particular, are in evidence in support of it. Even the works of such authors as Professor George Adam Smith, who in his notes upon Napoleon's Palestine letters has spoken in depreciation of it, do yet themselves confirm the theory in every part.

Both the geography and the topography of many ancient writings are treated with scant regard and justly so. Even the works of ancient geographers are often questioned, and sometimes found incorrect beyond dispute. In contrast with this attitude toward ancient geographical notices generally, there is nothing in ancient history so completely confirmed and so universally accepted as the trustworthiness of the geographical and topographical indications of Scripture.

The place, the most important mark of trustworthy testimony, is being established for the whole Bible story. This is not unimportant. In this fact we have a subfoundation for the confirmation of Scripture. The completion of the whole list of identifications is rapidly approaching, and the collocation of these identifications has given us anew, from entirely independent testimony of archæology, the whole outline of the Biblical narrative and its surroundings, at once the necessary material for the historical imagination and the surest foundation of apologetics. It is the identifications which differentiate history from myth,

geography from "the land of nowhere," the record of events from tales of "never was," Scripture from folklore and the gospel of the Saviour of the world from the delusions of hope.[1]

2. Another theory which has been substantiated is the theory of *the ethnographical correctness of Scripture.* That the relations between peoples as indicated in Scripture, the representations concerning kinship, concerning the origin, rise, and decline of nations, concerning suzerainty and servitude, are correct has been a working theory for all general purposes by nearly all students of the Word, and only departed from by a few for special ends.

Of one of the most remarkable geographic statements in all history, the tenth chapter of Genesis, Kautzsch says: "The so-called table of nations remains according to all the results of monumental research, an ethnographic original document of the first rank, which nothing can replace."[2] A mere glance along the lines of research indicated by this table of nations brings at once into view how remarkably this theory has been confirmed. Babylonia, a great stronghold of Semitism, is represented as originally founded by non-Semitic people of Cush, whom archæology has identified also as non-Semitic and given to them the name Accadians, and now Sumerians. Their origin has not yet been determined by research. Out of this non-Semitic Babylonia, the Bible says, "went forth Asshur and builded Nineveh and the city Rehoboth and Calah, and Resin between Nineveh and Calah: the same is a great city."[3] Thus the Assyrian civilization, so distinctly Semitic, is said to have come out of the non-

Semitic civilization of Babylonia. But the archæology of those lands confirms the statement. Then the table of nations in Genesis represents Canaanite civilization as originally Hamitic. "And the sons of Ham: Cush and Mizraim and Phut and Canaan." "And Canaan begat Sidon his first-born, and Heth and the Jebusite and the Amorite and the Girgasite and the Hivite and the Arkite and the Sinite, and the Arvadite and the Zemarite and the Hamathite: and afterward were the families of the Canaanites scattered abroad." History shows Canaan in later times to be unmistakably Semitic, and "the language of Canaan" a Semitic tongue. Yet archæological research confirms even this seeming confusion. The earliest remains at Gezer are distinctly not Semitic; yet, not only there, but everywhere else in the land, the only "language" of early times yet known is Semitic. Whether or not the Hamitic people of the earliest period spoke a Semitic tongue in that land it is impossible to say, but the "language of Canaan" in all historical time was Semitic until the Greek invasion.

Then the history of the international politics of Israel serves as a framework into which the results of archæological research may be arranged with perfect harmony, and even the details of that history are year by year being exactly confirmed.

Thus the progress of archæological research has sustained this general working theory of the ethnographic correctness of Scripture and every year adds the corroboration of some particular items which, for some special end, have been represented as against the theory. Indeed, that the general theory of the correctness of

the representations concerning tribal relationships in Scripture is being sustained is indisputable. The literature of the subject is so great and so varied and the names associated with it are the names of such distinguished scholars that there is need for no more than the mention of Hommel's *Hebrew Tradition*, Gunkel in the sixth chapter of *Israel and Babylonien*, Sayce in the second chapter of *Patriarchal Palestine*, Winckler in *Orientalistischen Litteratur-Zeitung*, December 15, 1906, and Budge in the *History of Egypt*, especially the first volume.

3. *The theory of a real system of chronology in the early Old Testament history*, in former times universally held, latterly much disputed, has been corroborated by archæological research. This is not to say that this or that "system" of chronology has been corroborated, a question which will be discussed in a later chapter, but only that the older theory of a *real trustworthy chronology in the Bible* is confirmed, and that the later theories of its unreliable character have not been sustained.

There is as yet a great deal of unsolved mystery about Biblical chronology, as about Egyptian and, indeed, about Oriental chronology generally. Here is, as yet, to a large extent, a *terra incognita*. One of the saddest features of the Bible controversy of the present day is the positive assertion of mathematical definiteness about stupendous antiquity put forth by writers on both sides of the controversy to sustain their theories. The one thing certainly and definitely known about ancient Oriental chronology is that it was lacking in the mathematical definiteness of present-day annals. No

one can, by any means at present available, check off a tally sheet, date by date, either for or against Bible chronology. While this is true and the Bible chronology is not fully understood, yet, at the same time it has been vindicated as a real system of chronology in which the period to which events are referred is correct, the order of events is the order in which they occurred, and the play and counterplay of influences are correctly timed and arranged. In this vindication, Egyptian explorations have an important part. It must be kept in mind also that the Assyrian chronology vindicates the Biblical system. The Egyptian and the Assyrian testimony is given by two equal and independent witnesses. Each strengthens the other, yet each is complete and satisfactory in itself.

Reference has been made to the indefiniteness of the Biblical chronology. In the account of the duration of the Egyptian sojourn of Israel,[1] the "four hundred years," "the fourth generation," and the "four hundred and thirty years" manifestly refer to the same period. "Generations" are evidently put for centuries; and the round number "four hundred" for the definte number "four hundred and thirty." The astonishingly frequent occurence of "forty years" or a multiple of forty years, or the half of forty years, points strongly towards a system in which forty years occupied a place and had a meaning akin to our use of the word "decade." The overlapping of reigns and lives was probably frequent. So the breaking of genealogies. A modern genealogy is supposed to be continuous. "The principle of these genealogies must have been different."[2] The genealogy of our Lord gives fourteen generations from Abraham

to David, an average of nearly sixty years to a generation on the lowest computation. There was no ignorance, no incorrect statement on the part of the sacred writer, who wrote to Jews familiar with genealogies and with the principle upon which they were constructed, and having right at hand the means of verification. His words were liable to no misunderstanding among them. The system was then perfectly understood.

The ignorance is on our part, and the mystery lies in our very imperfect understanding of the technicalities of the Biblical systems of chronology and genealogy. Perhaps when the mystery is solved, the chronological system of the Bible will be found to correspond not so much to our system of months, years, centuries, and millenniums, as to our other system of decades, generations, ages, and eras. It may be said, But they used definite numbers. It may be replied, A definite number underlies our word "decade." Then, it is certain that the Biblical system of chronology is twofold. There is an historical system and, in addition a prophetic system founded upon the historical, in which a day stands for a year and a month for thirty years; facts which need no illustration here.

Now the Egyptian explorations furnish a parallel and an illustration of the same *kind* of a system, and a comparison of some details of Biblical and Egyptian chronology completes the confirmation of the Biblical system as a real system. Egyptian chronology displays this same indefiniteness which often seems so much like contradiction. There is the same overlapping of reigns and the same computation by periods as well as by calendar years, with a like confusing multiplication of

measuring periods. There is also a double system as in the Bible, one historical and the other based upon it, "the reign of the gods," in which a month or a season is put for a year. Thus the main features of the chronological system of the Old Testament are found in the Egyptian system. Certainly forgers of the VIIth or the Vth century B. C., who are reputed by some critics to have assigned dates to a history, in part invented, and falsely attributed to early national heroes, never had anything to do with the Egyptian system. These pious Jewish Münchausens certainly did not do so extensive a business of historical counterfeiting as to cover all antiquity. The more rational conclusion is that this kind of a chronological system having its independent parallel in the system of Egypt of patriarchal days, was a real system. That it was so, is shown conclusively by the synchronizing of events in the two systems. By pursuing independent investigations in both Egyptian and Biblical chronology and history and arranging the results in parallel columns, we find that Josiah is side by side with Pharaoh Necho, as the Bible places him; Hezekiah with Tirhaka: and Rehoboam with Shishak. The Biblical account of the Exodus is properly timed with the Israel inscription[1] of Meremptah II; and the period of the sojourn in Egypt from Joseph to Moses lies side by side with the "four hundred years" of the Rameses tablet,[2] counting from the Hyksos king Nubti near the time of Apophis the Pharaoh of Joseph, to the reign of Rameses the Great, the Pharaoh of the Oppression. These are but a few of the multitude of synchronisms which may be traced between the chronological system of the Bible

and that of ancient Egypt. It is incredible that a chronology invented for a history, in part imaginary and largely flung back upon earlier times and associated with national heroes for the purpose of giving them a brighter halo, should have such remarkable verifications in parallel columns with real history. The only reasonable conclusion is that the Bible in its early history has a real system of chronology and this goes far toward establishing a real history. It is hard to believe that the highly wrought artificiality of the modern historical novel had a place in the literature of that day. In fact it had not; an assertion the proof of which no one will call for.[1]

It is interesting to note that this chronological system of the Bible corresponds much more to the Egyptian than to the Assyrian system. This is as it should be on the Bible's own claim of Egyptian authorship or associations for so much of the early Biblical record, and rather peculiar, to say the least, on the critical supposition that Babylonian influences predominated.

4. The theory of *the correctness of the imagery of the Bible* is being sustained, as witness the whole body of discoveries from the very beginning of archæological research to the present time. This theory is another of the fundamental and universal working theories of criticism which is however, sometimes, in the heat of controversy, forgotten and its importance overlooked or even belittled. But, whatever the theory of the origin and the authorship of the various books of the Bible, there is always, with only a few special exceptions, the underlying assumption on the part of the critics of the correctness of the imagery reflecting the

topography, the flora and the fauna, the seasons, the customs and the institutions. Indeed, upon the trustworthiness of the imagery as upon exactness in the use of words, criticism depends. Etymology only provides the bones of words, it is imagery that supplies flesh and blood and the breath of life, and something more also; it supplies that which in a person we call the countenance.

Thus the importance of the imagery becomes very far-reaching. It is no mere unimportant accident of the characteristics of a book that its imagery is correct. If it had a false countenance, it would be so far a false book. If it has professedy an imaginary countenance, it so far definitely limits its scope for teaching the truth. This truthfulness of countenance marks the difference between romance and realism in fiction, and gives to realism so much wider field for the teaching of truth. It makes to some extent also the difference between history of the old school and history of the new; between the impassioned declamation of Prescott and the word painting of Ridpath. It makes, alas! the difference between a real newspaper and the works of fiction which the so-called journalism of today so often inflicts upon a too credulous public.

Then, a witness in court who is caught in inaccuracies of coloring in his description of an event, *i.e.*, the imagery of whose story is not correct, is a discredited witness; while the witness, the imagery of whose testimony is accurate in every respect, ingratiates himself at once in the esteem of the jurymen as probably in other respects a trustworthy witness. So, while the correctness of the imagery of the Bible does not extend

its guarantee to every detail of the testimony of the book, it does give it a *good countenance*, which commends it much. *Without* that good countenance, the Bible would be a discredited book. And it is not difficult to imagine how such inaccuracy of imagery, if it existed, would be used by critics to discredit utterly the book as a revelation from God or even a trustworthy teacher of this modern self-sufficient world in any respect.

Now this correctness of imagery, this underlying assumption of criticism of every hue, is being confirmed indisputably in its general features, and corroborated year by year in its minutest details, even in those special features of the imagery which for any reason have been disputed. To this end testify the whole company of Oriental residents, intelligent travelers and scientific investigators, from Napoleon in his account of his Eastern campaigns[1] to Robinson[2] and Stanley,[3] learned travelers; Thompson,[4] for nearly half a century a resident of the land, Van Lennep,[5] Palmer,[6] in the *Desert of the Exodus*, and the distinguished Clermont Ganneau,[7] in his *Archæological Researches*. To these now may be added Van Dyke,[8] of the present day, traveler, essayist, poet, who comes to us with what he says is to him a new conviction "that Christianity is an out-of-doors religion. From the birth in the grotto at Bethlehem (where Joseph and Mary took refuge because there was no room for them in the inn) to the crowning death on the hill of Calvary outside the city wall, all of its important events took place out of doors. Except the discourse in the upper chamber at Jerusalem, all of its great words, from the Sermon on the Mount to the last commission to the disciples, were spoken in the open air.

How shall we understand it unless we carry it under the free sky and interpret it in the companionship of nature?" Because we can do so and find the imagery corresponding to the reality, the interpretation carries conviction with it.

5. Then the theory of *the accuracy of Scripture in both the originals and the copies* has been corroborated to a most remarkable extent. Every theory of inspiration consciously postulates this theory of accuracy in greater or less degree, and there are persons who believe that unconsciously it is always in the greater degree, on the ground that inspiration of a literature cannot secure anything that it does not secure through the exercise of care over the words. For no page of literature conveys anything that it does not convey through its words. Indeed, the most prevalent analytical theory of Scripture put forth by criticism, with its lists of words indicating, so it is asserted, a various authorship, demands for its very life a degree of accuracy and invariableness in the use of words in both writing of the originals and in the transmission of them by copyists greater than that demanded by any, the most exacting, theory of inspiration. Even the theory of verbal inspiration allows the varying of language by authors through the use of synonyms and other equivalent expressions; but what inextricable confusion would be introduced into the critical analysis, if it should be shown that such latitude was taken in varying the characteristic phraseology of the original authors according to which the analysis is made, or that many inaccuracies had crept into the transmission of the same by copists! The consideration of the problem so

presented is a task for the critics, which, however, they have to the present time almost wholly ignored.[1] The contribution which archæology makes to this subject is that wherever it has been possible to test the statements of Scripture in its multitudinous historical notices and its other references to fact, the Bible has been found correct to a remarkable degree, and that in its present form and even in minute peculiarities of statement. No one can compare with Scripture statements the works of Brugsch,[2] Naville,[3] Petrie,[4] Rawlinson,[5] Botta,[6] Layard,[7] Sayce,[8] Vincent,[9] Hilprecht,[10] Clay,[11] Steindorf,[12] and a score of others without being deeply impressed with the fact that this theory of the accuracy of Scripture, demanded by every variety of views of inspiration, and still more by the critical analysis of the books of the Bible by means of lists of words, is fully, even surprisingly, sustained by the results of archæology.

CHAPTER VI

Theories not Affecting the Historicity or Integrity of Scripture Corroborated—Continued

The theories thus far mentioned, as being corroborated by archæological evidence, have been of a general character. Such are of the greatest importance. For, although popular acclaim is awarded most readily to exact corroboration of some particular event or the finding of some particular object of note in Bible history, such particular events and objects all put together are scarcely worth one well-confirmed general principle or fact extending its influence over the whole historical field. Still, in addition to the evidence which has been presented sustaining general principles or facts, a few of the special discoveries may profitably be considered in illustration of this part of the subject.

6. The theory of *the location of the garden of Eden* in the great valley of the Euphrates in the northwest portion of Chaldea. It is not necessary at this point nor for the purpose here in view to discriminate among the various theological interpretations of the garden of Eden. For, whether the mythical element in the story of beginnings at Eden be much or little or nothing, whether the story is intended to be an account of one of the beginnings or of the one beginning of the race, it is universally believed that history and the race had a beginning, and that this story of Eden purports to give a beginning, to focalize the streams of history in one principle fountain somewhere in the Euphrates valley.

From this same general region in western Asia, also, the second dispersion is represented to have taken place. Thus, according to the Bible account, Eden, notwithstanding the subsequent destruction of men by the Flood and the repeopling of the world, remains the starting point of the race.

The theory of this location of the point of departure for the dispersion of the race, as indicated both by the record in the Bible and by facts ascertained through research, is all but universally held. It cannot be said that it is yet definitely substantiated, but it is receiving cumulative corroboration along ethnological and philological lines. Wherever it is possible to trace back lines of migration of the early nations mentioned, or to gather notes of direction from the traditions of various peoples, or discover indications of the derivation of languages, it is always found that the ultimate direction is toward a comparatively small area in western Asia.

7. *The geological theory of the flood* of Noah as the last great change in land levels is being most exactly confirmed not only by investigations in glacial history, but by examination of the records of that cataclysm that befell the antediluvian world which are still to be seen written upon the mountains and valleys of Europe and of central and western Asia.

Concerning the time at which geologic changes may have had part in the great catastrophe of the Deluge, Professor Salisbury has this to say: "The date and duration of the glacial epoch are matters of greatest interest, but neither has been determined with numerical exactness. Many lines of calculation, all of them confessedly more or less uncertain, point to the retreat of

the last ice sheet from the northern part of the United States six thousand or ten thousand years ago. While these figures are to be looked upon as estimates only, there are so many lines of evidence pointing in the same direction that the recency (geologically speaking) of the last glaciation must be looked on as established. The best data for the calculations which have led to the above results are furnished by Niagara Falls and the Falls of St. Anthony, at Minneapolis. In each case, the distance the falls has receded since the ice disappeared, and the present rate of recession are known with some degree of approximation to the truth. Assuming the rate of recession to have been uniform, the above results as to the duration of post-glacial times for these localities are obtained."[1]

Professor Wright believes the events of this glacial time to have been a *vera causa* of the Deluge. "By attention to the general conditions accompanying the glacial epoch, we are led to the recognition of the existence of a unique period of instability in the relations of land and water levels which passed away only a few thousand years ago. For a brief geological period, the ocean beds were relieved of an immense mass of water, which was piled up in the shape of ice upon the northern continents. After a time, which was very brief as geologists reckon it, this ice melted off, relieving the glacial area from its pressure, and restoring it again to its original place in the ocean." "The geologist, therefore, need not be disturbed by such a consummation of events as is described in the Biblical story of the Flood, but he well may be surprised at the sobriety of the account, at the prominence given to "the breaking up

of the fountains of the great deep," and at the assurance that the earth is no more to be destroyed by a flood; for these characteristics of the Biblical story are not the natural products of the human imagination, but show that the narrator was restrained, either by personal knowledge of the facts or by the guidance of divine inspiration."[1]

Turning to the geologic evidence of the Deluge found in Europe and Asia, Professor Wright says: "Longer and wider study of the facts of surface geology reveals more and more clearly a considerable residuum of phenomena which indicate a brief post-glacial submergence, since man's advent, of a large part of Europe and Asia."[2] "At numerous places over the southern counties of England and on the south side of Dover Strait at Sangatte, near Calais, in France, there are deposits of angular gravel bearing no relation to the present drainage systems of the country, and containing palæolithic implements and the bones of extinct animals associated with prehistoric man."[3] "The first expedition [to Asia] was undertaken in the expectation of finding in eastern and northern Asia signs of the occupation of those regions by glacial ice similar to those which exist so abundantly in corresponding latitudes in North America. In this we were disappointed . . . . But in place of glacial phenomena we found evidence of a recent depression of the area, amounting to somewhere from two thousand to three thousand feet. This evidence largely consists in the distribution of loess over China, Central Asia, and southern Russia."[4] "Baron Richthofen, in his great work on 'China,' maintained that the source of the Chinese loess was to be found in

the desiccated area of Central Mongolia now occupied by the Desert of Gobi [by the agency of the wind]."[1] "But it seems necessary, from the facts . . . . . to believe that its present distribution over northeastern China was mainly secured by the agency of gradually receding water, the presence of which would be obtained by a temporary general depression of the land, amounting at any rate to several hundred feet."[2] "But whatever doubts might be raised respecting such a recent depression of land as we have supposed in China, they cannot well exist concerning a corresponding depression on the other side of the great central Asiatic plateau, facing Siberia and Turkestan."[3] "All these things point to the fact that in those world-wide movements which characterized the latter part of the Tertiary and the whole of the Glacial period, there was a brief subsidence of the Asiatic continent—Central Asia, perhaps, playing see-saw with Northwestern Europe and Northeastern America, the one going down while the other went up. But, however that may be, at some stage during this later period of geological instability, a general depression of Central Asia must have occurred to account for the phenomena we have presented, distributing the loess in the peculiar manner indicated and filling the central depression of Mongolia with an interior sea."[4] "Man undoubtedly came into the world before the unstable equilibrium accompanying later Tertiary time and the whole course of the Glacial epoch had given place to the comparative quiet which now prevails."[5]

Thus is seen a bringing together of the conclusions of science and the statements of Scripture which no one

could have foreseen fifty years ago, and which may well give pause to all those who have thought there could be no final agreement between science and revelation.

8. *The geological theory of the destruction of the cities of the Plain* has also been very exactly confirmed by the examination of the strata. Professor Emerson, one of our most eminent geologists, describes the region about the Dead Sea as one "where sulphur, deposited by many hot springs, is abundant in the clay, and where bitumen oozes from every crevice of the rock, and every earthquake dislodges great sheets of it from the bottom of the lake."[1] The independent investigations of Wright and Blanckenkorn reached practically the same conclusions. Also our Xenia Seminary expedition to the Cities of the Plain in 1924 confirmed these findings of these eminent geologists. A bituminous region, a great stratum of rock salt capped by sulphur-bearing marls and conglomerates cemented by bitumen, an explosion of pentup gases, which collect in such geological formations, blowing the burning sulphur high into the air, and the waters of the Jordan coming down and dissolving the ruptured rock-salt stratum—all this provides for exactly what the Bible describes and for the conditions found there today; the pillar of smoke rising up to heaven, the rain of fire and brimstone falling back from the blowing-off crater, and the catching of Lot's wife in the cataclysm and her incrustation with salt. Professor Emerson says it was a "sinking of the ground, at the time when geology and history join, which, with its earthquakes, overthrew the cities of the Plain and caused the outpour of petroleum from the many fault-fissures and the escape of great volumes of

sulphurous and gaseous emanation, which, ignited, either spontaneously, by lightning, or by chance, furnished the brimstone and fire from heaven, and the smoke of the land going up as the smoke of a furnace which Abraham saw from the plains of Judea."[1]

The only thing which the Bible account adds to that which may be seen by the geologist and the archæologist is that which is shown by the hand which draws aside the veil between the seen and the unseen. The scientist here sees and writes from the standpoint of materials and facts, the Bible writer saw and wrote from the standpoint of divine providence over the materials and the facts. The veil is drawn aside in the Bible account and we are permitted to see not only natural phenomena but special miraculous supervision over them. A sight of this latter was the revelation God made at that time to Abraham.

9. It has long been thought that there might be some *relation between the mysterious Hyksos kings of Egypt and the patriarchs.* It has, indeed, seemed almost necessary that there should be some such relationship, if we are to account at all for the favorable reception, even royal distinction, given the patriarchs by these kings. The readiness with which the patriarchs went down into Egypt on occasion, as though their going were a matter of course, seems also to call for some such explanation in view of the general national exclusiveness of ancient times and the antipathy, extreme even in that age, which Egypt always manifested to an influx of foreigners. The reception accorded to Abraham in Egypt and later to Jacob and his sons[2] and especially the elevation of Joseph the slave boy to be prime minis-

ter, peremptorily demand either the belief in a suitable historical setting for the stories or the acknowledgement of a mythical element in them. Obscure, insignificant, private citizens are not accorded such recognition at a foreign and unfriendly court. Some have been conceding a mythical element in the stories. Professor Barton discusses the question with great learning and, while desiring to think Abraham an historical personage, yet says: "On the other hand, any fair estimate of the bearing of archæology upon the Abrahamic problem must take into account the facts brought to light by archæology which favor the theories of those who believe that Abraham was a moon-god. The name Abram, of which Abraham is but a variant form, means if it is of West-Semitic origin, 'exalted Father.' Biblical traditions connect Abraham with Harran and Ur, seats of the worship of the moon-god, Sin. In Babylonian mythology, Sin was the father of Shamash, the sun-god, and of Ishtar. In Babylonian hymns one of the most frequent epithets of Sin is 'Father' which in Semitic is 'Ab.' 'The exalted Father,' if Abraham's name, fits, it must be confessed, the moon-god theory. Sarah, or Sarai, the name of Abraham's wife, is the Hebrew equivalent of *Saratu*, 'Queen,' an epithet of the consort of the moon-god at Harran, and Milcah, Abraham's sister-in-law (Genesis ii, 29) is the Hebrew equivalent of *Malkatu*, the name of the consort of the sun-god, and perhaps of the moon-god also. These facts do not prove Abraham a moon-god; absolute proof that a character is mythical is even more difficult than to prove it historical. We cannot, however, wonder that, in the absence of proof from contemporary sources

that Abraham was a person, such fact had great weight."[1] H. P. Smith thinks "we have no really historical knowledge of a patriarchal period preceding Israel's conquest of Canaan. The individuals, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, are eponyms—personifications of clans, or ethnological groups— and they are nothing more."[2]

Wellhausen had long ago said that Genesis gives us "no historical knowledge of the patriarchs, but only of the time when the stories about them rose in the Israelite people: this later age is here unconsciously projected, in its inner and outer features, into hoar antiquity, and is reflected there like a glorified image."[3]

But critics have been too hasty in these concessions to the insistent claim put forth for a mythological element in early Bible history. The archæologists have now uncovered to view such appropriate historical setting for the patriarchal stories that these narratives no longer present to us the patriarchs as obscure, insignificant, private citizens, nor Zoan as a foreign and unfriendly court. The presence of the Semitic tongue in Hyksos territory has long been known. A quarter of a century ago Brugsch wrote: "The Khar spoke their own language—Phœnician—which is the only foreign tongue mentioned on the monuments with a distinct reference to its importance. Whoever lived in Egypt spoke Egyptian, whoever lived in the south had to speak the language of the Nahasu, or dark-colored people; while those who went northward to the Asiatic region had to be acquainted with the language of the Phœnicians, in order to converse at all intelligibly with the inhabitants of the country."[4] The patriarchs

would have little or no difficulty in the use of their own language in that part of Egypt to which they went.

These Phœnicians were very important in Egypt. As the English, the Germans, and the French have long done the foreign business of China, so that the Chinese flag has scarcely been known in foreign ports, and as the Portuguese, the Dutch and the English have in turn been mistress of the sea in modern times, so in the old days of Egypt, from before patriarchal times until much later, Phœnicia, the mistress of the sea in that age, did the foreign business of the Egyptians,[1] and not until later times did the Egyptian standard venture into foreign ports, and never very much. What more natural than that the patriarchs in their need should turn at once for help to a place where they might transact their business through their kinsmen?

Then, some familiarity, even sympathy, with Semitic religion is strongly to be suspected from the interviews between the patriarchs and the Hyksos kings. Joseph speaks to Pharaoh of "God" as to one who needed no explanation of the person and character of the God of the patriarchs, and Pharaoh responds understandingly. He does not ask: "What God has done this?" and does not say: "thy God," but "forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this," not Ptah or Atum, as usual among Egyptians, but "God."

The relation between the patriarchs and the Hyksos, thus indicated by so many incidental touches in the sacred narrative, has been cleared up with a good deal of definiteness through the discovery in 1906, by Professor Petrie,[2] of the great fortified camp at Tell el-Yehudiyeh; and the question is now in the main set at

rest. In the lower stratum of *debris* was found the fortified camp of invaders. The abundance of Hyksos scarabs in this stratum and the almost total absence of all others mark the camp as certainly a Hyksos camp.[1] The original defenses were built with the long sloping outer wall which indicates the use of the bow for defense.[2] Finally, the name Hyksos, Egyptian *Haq Shashu*, "Bedouin Princes," brings out sharp and clear the picture of which we have for a long time had glimpses, of the Hyksos as wandering tribes of the desert, of "upper and lower Ruthen;[3] *i.e.*, Syria and Palestine and northern and western Arabia, "bow people," as the Egyptians called them, their traditional enemies as far back as pyramid times,[4] who pushed in from the East, made a lodgment in Egypt, usurped the reins of government and were on the throne when the patriarchs came.[5]

Now, why should not the patriarchs have had a royal reception among these? They were themselves the heads of wandering tribes of upper and lower Ruthen, in the tongue of the Egyptians, *Haq Shashu*, "Bedouin Princes." Among princes, a prince is a prince no matter how small his principality. So Abraham, the Bedouin Prince, was accorded princely consideration at the Bedouin court in Egypt; Joseph, the Bedouin slave, became again the Bedouin Prince when the wisdom of God with him and his rank by birth became known; and Jacob and his other sons were welcomed with all their followers and their wealth as a valuable accession to the court party, always harassed by the restive and rebellious native princes. This does not prove racial identity between the Hyksos and the

patriarchs but indicates a very close tribal relationship. There is nothing to prove that all Bedouin were Semities. Nor does this discovery identify Abraham or either of the other patriarchs individually in history, but it does take away every suspicious appearance of a mythological element in the narrative of the reception accorded the patriarchs in Egypt and harmonizes completely with the theory of some such relationship subsisting between the patriarchs and the Hyksos kings.

CHAPTER VII

Theories not Affecting the Historicity or Integrity of Scripture Discredited

Having sufficiently illustrated in the two preceding chapters critical theories not affecting the historicity or integrity of Scripture which have been corroborated by the results of archæological research, we proceed now to examine

II. THEORIES DISCREDITED

Some long-cherished theories not affecting the historicity or integrity of Scripture have been discredited by archæological evidence.

1. *Abraham in his wanderings formerly made a very pathetic picture in all eyes.* A godly man, because of his godliness, was pictured as leaving behind him native land, settled government, the light of civilization, familiar laws and customs, and the tongue of childhood. To all this was added the deprivation and hardship and dangers attendant upon a pioneer among a half-barbarous people in a strange land. The last four hundred years, during which Europe and America have both been torn by the separations and the deprivations and the sorrows of emigration, have prepared a sympathetic world to pity such as Abraham was pictured to be. Much of historical imagination and of pulpit eloquence has been wrought into the amplification of the portrayal of this hardship and loneliness.

The first pilgrim father of the faith, called of God and sent upon a great mission, stands and will ever stand, one of the most striking and inspiring figures in all history; but the pathos of emigration to a strange land which has enveloped the story has almost wholly evaporated.

Palestine in the days of Abraham was a part of the Babylonian empire. The familiar Hammurabi laws, though not codified until after Abraham's emigration, threw about Abraham their protection in the West as in the East.[1] "Abram the Hebrew"[2] came into a land in which, of all places on earth, the Hebrew tongue was at home. If semi-nomadic life was quite in vogue in the land of the Amorite, it was no strange state or novel experience for Abraham, for he only lived *there* the life he *brought with him.* He came not as a lone emigrant to a Bedouin experience, but moved about as a Bedouin Prince, and, on occasion, put three hundred and eighteen men of his "trained servants, born in his own house,"[3] into the field armed for battle, if battle there should be. Such was the life of the day in the West land of the Great Sea. Then the method of writing and the literary language of the land were the Babylonian script and the Babylonian tongue. And though the sovereignty of Babylonia was somewhat uncertain and insecure at the time, the jealous enemies on the southwest, the Hyksos dynasty of Egypt, were themselves "Bedouin Princes" who were ready to accord Abraham a royal welcome, and a safe retreat from famine.

Thus the pathetic picture of a pioneer career in a dangerous land has grown dim and dimmer until at last it has faded out completely in the ever-increasing light of

contemporary history brought out by Babylonian and Palestinian and Egyptian discoveries. At the same time, Abraham, the pilgrim father of the faith, has loomed greater and greater.

2. *Then there is Melchizedek, High Priest of mystery,* "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life."[1] Beautiful theories concerning him have been much disturbed, yet without affecting in any way the use made of his strange character in the Epistle to the Hebrews or the theological conceptions there founded upon that character.

What a host of pious winged imaginings have been let loose by commentators in all ages in explanation of this strange personage Melchizedek. "The opinion of the ancient Jews and Samaritans, and general tradition, that Melchizedek was Shem, is most elaborately supported by the editor of Calmet."[2] Origen thought he was an angel. He "of whom neither father nor mother nor pedigree stands recorded in holy Scripture"[3] has been the usual interpretation from the Fathers down to modern times. Dwight, the American editor of Meyer *on Hebrews,* thinks "when it is said, therefore, that Melchizedek was without father and mother, and that he had neither beginning nor end of life, the meaning of the writer is not: that Melchizedek *as a man* differed from all other men, having no descent from ancestors and existing always; but that, *in respect to his priestly office,* he did not depend on the tracing of a genealogy, as the Levitical priests did, but had his priesthood 'continually abiding.'"[4] Finally, Dr. Marcus Dods says of Melchizedek: "Perhaps even in his

own time, there was none who could point to the place where first he was cradled, nor show the tent round which first he played in his boyhood nor hoard up a single relic of the years of the man that had arisen to be the first man upon earth" and that "there emerges from an obscure Canaanite valley a man nearer to God than Abraham."[1]

The mystery around the king of Salem has not yet all been dispelled, but the Tell Amarna tablets reveal[2] to us a line of kings about the middle of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt holding the scepter at Jerusalem only by the authority of the king of Egypt. They were of unique title, disclaiming any hereditary rights in the crown, saying, "It was not my father and it was not my mother who established me in this position, but it was the mighty arm of the king himself who made me master of the lands and possessions of my father." This title, over the exact translation of which there has been much learned, technical wrangling, occurs not once only, but seems to have been required at every formal mention of the sovereignty of the king. This does not fully illumine all the mystery of Melchizedek and his strange priesthood, it does not identify him individually, but it does suggest very pertinently an exceedingly natural and simple explanation, and it is not easy to escape the conviction that it points in the direction in which a full understanding of this mysterious personage lies.

3. *The old and generally accepted system of Biblical chronology is passing away.* Biblical chronology has been vindicated as a real chronology, a system accurately paralleled by the chronological system of ancient

Egypt.[1] But the theory of chronology long current and still vigorously advocated by many (strange to say more vigorously by those who hold the chronology of the Bible to be very inaccurate than by those who believe it to be a true and correct chronology),—this theory has been much modified, if not utterly discredited, by both archæological and ethnological research. The history of the race and the evidence from the *débris* of ruined cities imperatively demand more time than that theory of the chronology of the world allows, and the vast number of dates produced by archæological inscriptions and manuscripts show beyond question that the chronology of that age was not constructed with the mathematical rigidity of the nautical almanac. Whatever may have been the system and method of chronology in use in early Biblical history, it certainly was not the same as our epochal chronology based upon exact astronomic time. The early chronologies of the Orient were usually annalistic, ofttimes synchronistic, but very seldom epochal. The first and usually the only intent of present-day chronology is to record the flight of time; ancient systems often introduced a moral element. Events rather than time were recorded and the time in which nothing was done and the man who did nothing were apt to be passed over in silence. Sometimes events were not simply chronicled as now in uncompromising order, but were arranged symmetrically, and sometimes the visional conception of events, which sees things in order, in perspective and in proportion, yet without strict regard to the length of time intervening, the method found in Biblical prophecy, was also used in writing history. Certain it is that ancient

Oriental thought regarded man's relations to life as far more important than his relation to time, a more deeply moral conception of chronology than ours.

In the light of research into antiquity, the rigidity of the astronomical theory of chronology must give way to a more flexible system in keeping with the days when there were no clocks or almanacs and people did not think in the terms of these later inventions. All early events of the Bible history, of course, took place at exact dates B.C., and it may some day be possible to determine those dates, though that is exceedingly improbable, but even that would not furnish any evidence whatever that the early sacred writers wrote from the standpoint of an epochal conception of chronology and what they say about the time of events must be judged according to their ideas of chronology and not according to ours.

CHAPTER VIII

Theories Affecting the Integrity or Historicity of Scripture

Thus far in the history of the application of archæological evidence to critical problems, we have remained upon neutral territory occupied in harmony by all classes of critics, where theories, whether confirmed or discredited, do not affect the integrity or historicity of Scripture. We are now to pass the frontier and enter upon disputed ground, as we consider: SECONDLY, THEORIES AFFECTING THE INTEGRITY OR HISTORICITY OF SCRIPTURE. Many theories proposing to take Scripture at other than its face value, *i. e.*, reconstructive theories (which necessarily, from their sinister presupposition that the face value of Scripture is not the true value, as well as from their destructive method, attack the integrity or historicity of Scripture), have been utterly discredited by archæological evidence and in some cases abandoned by those who held them.

It must not be supposed that this is universally admitted to be the case. There are many confident assertions that it is otherwise. Driver in one of his latest critical utterances, the *Addenda* to the Seventh Edition of Genesis,[1] refers with evident satisfaction to a treatise "on the true bearings of archæology on the Old Testament, an excellent and lucid article by Stanley A. Cook, in the *Expositor*, June, 1908, especially pp. 529 ff, 534 ff where it is shown, among other things, that the idea, still current in some quarters, that archæology

has overthrown many of the conclusions of literary and historical criticism has been based simply upon a misconception of the facts." With like self-satisfaction he sends the reader to the inaugural address of A. S. Peake, a professor at Manchester University, who concludes concerning the results of archæology that "it remains true, that, so far as the Old Testament scholarship is concerned, it has not confirmed a single position doubted by sober criticism."[1]

One of the "quarters" above referred to is now to be heard from. And it is proposed not simply to allow assertion to stand over against assertion. Instead, the examination of a few instances of the effect which archæology has had upon "positions doubted by sober criticism" will enable every reader to judge for himself what are the real facts in the case. Let us *see* whether or not archæology has "confirmed a single position doubted by sober criticism" and so discredited any of the reconstructive theories.

I. THEORIES DISCREDITED

Of such cases let us consider some theories which to most minds brought to the examination of the evidence would seem to have been discredited.

1. *The ignorance of the Patriarchal age* was once a frontier fortress in criticism which frightened away all literary pretensions beyond that limit. This theory of ignorance in the patriarchal age was not held by all advocates of a reconstructive criticism, but it was held by some and at one time was quite the vogue, though there are a good many today who seem to wish that time to be forgotten. The interests of truth, however,

sometimes require unpleasant things to be remembered and unpleasant facts to be cited. This is one such case, for there are those among the humbler followers of the more expert critics who still assert with vehemence that no such time ever was.

Let us then see the facts. Von Bohlen scoffed at the idea of the "undisciplined horde"[1] of Israel possessing a knowledge of letters.

Reuss says: "Now, and this is needful immediately at this stage of our information, it is permitted and with good reason, to ask whether to the extent here presumed they knew how to speak in Moses' time of the art of writing among the Israelites, and of the other thereto pertaining arts. Granted even that this one was instructed in the wisdom of Egypt, according to the tradition, the Canaanitish writing, of which the Hebrew made use as far as history reaches, was yet unknown there. Shall he be said to have invented the same? Moreover, no man writes any books whatever but for men who can read, and read well. These thoughts ought not, however, to be set up as entirely decisive. It may be that the theory of a widely spread Old-Semitic culture is justified, still the peculiar character of the law and this collection together give the decision on the question of the origin."[2]

Dillmann says: "But also the legal portion of the Pentateuch cannot be from Moses, neither written by him nor delivered orally and written down by another. And aside from the fact, that so extended a literary production at the very rise of the people of Israel is not believable, and points much more to a time when the arts of writing and reading were widely diffused there

appear also in the legal as in the narrative portion so many repetitions, variations . . . . and contradictions of the legal principal in addition to so great formal or redactional dissimilarities . . . . and likewise a series of book-divisions belonging together in what concerns the contents and language and yet distinguished from one another that even on that account a single source of this law-writing is not to be thought of."[1]

Driver says: "It is not denied that the patriarchs possessed the art of writing."[2] This would seem to be a concession which carried with it the whole contention, in view of the persistent Hebrew tradition concerning the patriarchal literature. For, given the body of literature attributed by the Hebrew people to the patriarchal age, and conceded that the patriarchs had letters, one naturally expects that the concession prepares the way for acceptance of at least some portion of the literature. So that one is hardly prepared for the remark with which Driver immediately draws back from the effect of the concession he has made, declaring that the possession of a literature by Israel "is a mere hypothesis for the truth of which no positive ground can be alleged." That is a very convenient conclusion having distinct regard for Driver's critical theory that the patriarchs had no literature! but is it quite warranted? Thoreau once said that sometimes circumstantial evidence is very persuasive, as "when one finds a trout in the milk." It is possible to suppose that the milkman by mistake may have taken the trout pail when he went out to milk, but the people who would be satisfied with that supposition are not many. So it is with the supposition of the patriarchs having the art of writing, but no litera-

ture, being writers, so to speak, but never writing anything. This looks like a trout in the milk. People must have a little time in which to learn to write, but where have they long had letters without leaving some record behind them? Most people who do not have a theory imperatively demanding the opinion that the patriarchs had no literature will be likely to think with Dr. Orr that "if such knowledge was possessed by Moses and those about him, there can be little doubt that it would be used."[1]

That the theory of the ignorance of the patriarchal age has been absolutely abandoned by every one hardly needs to be stated. Indeed, as we shall immediately see, radical criticism as well as the most conservative, is built upon the literary character of the patriarchal age as a foundation fact, although this had often, with the most marvelous inconsistency, been lost sight of, and by some positively denied. For it is at the finding of the law in the days of Josiah that the two lines of criticism diverge. But whether the law was found in good faith or "found" (with the euphemistic quotation marks instead of the disagreeable charge of forgery), it depended for its acceptance upon an unquestioning belief by the people in a literary history of the nation reaching back to the days of Moses. Without that belief, the book of the law could not have been accepted by the people as from their national hero. The knowledge which the people in Josiah's day possessed concerning their literary history can hardly be questioned. They certainly knew whether or not they had been a literary people. Belief in such a literary history could have arisen only out of an unbroken history of the

actual possession of a literature. Such a tradition may have grown with the years, but could not arise before the literary career of the nation began. And since the tradition ran back to Moses unquestioningly for the acceptance of this document of Josiah's time, the literary career of the nation certainly did not begin after the Mosaic age.

This belief in a literary history of Israel back to the days of the patriarchs, whether held by modern critics or by the people in the days of Josiah, is fully sustained by archæological research. Evidence has been found of the establishment of a postal system in Babylonia extending to its Palestine province in the days of Naram-Sin,[1] about seventeen hundred and fifty years[2] before the time of Abraham. Professor Sayce says: "There was an excellent postal service connecting Canaan with Babylonia which went back to the days of Naram-Sin, and some of the clay *bullae* which served as stamps for the official correspondence at that period are now in the Museum of the Louvre." But a postal system implies many things. That it requires the art of writing is self-evident, and a very little thought will make it equally certain to any one that it calls for a wide diffusion of the art. The necessity for a few government messages and the sending of an occasional manuscript from one learned author to another will hardly account for the establishment of a general postal system. It is only some four centuries since the demands of the modern world brought about the establishment of such a postal system. Even modern literary history existed among English-speaking people well-nigh a century after the Renaissance before the establishment of such a general postal system.

It is known, also, that many of the patriarchal customs conformed strictly to written law. Palestine in the Abrahamic age was still dominated by Babylonian literary influences and in some good measure was under Babylonian political control. The Code of Hammurabi exactly provides for much of the conduct of the people which is recorded of those days; *e.g.*, inheritance by a servant from a childless master, death by fire as a penalty for whoredom, the giving of a handmaid by her mistress to her husband as a secondary wife, and the dismissal of such secondary wife for acting spitefully and contemptuously toward the principal wife.

Finally, the discovery of the Tell Amarna tablets[1] in 1887 turned the full light of day upon this subject. These tablets reveal the literary conditions in Palestine about midway between Abraham and Moses. The widest diffusion of letters is indicated. All sorts of people are found writing letters: governors and court officers, petty officials, private citizens, ladies and servants. When there is added to all this the overwhelming evidence of the general culture and refinement of patriarchal Palestine, from recent excavations at Gezer, Lachish, Jerecho, Taanach and elsewhere, the case for the theory of patriarchal ignorance becomes ridiculous. No wonder some people desire to forget it and to have everybody else forget that it ever was a theory.

While the exact state of patriarchal civilization is not yet fully known, any theory of ignorance and illiteracy in that age and land is impossible.

2. *The theory of the nomadic, semi-barbarous condition of Palestine and the impossibility of high moral and*

religious ideas among the patriarchs before the Exodus, though most closely connected with the theory of the ignorance of patriarchal times, demands separate notice because of its bearing upon the *motif* of the current reconstructive criticism, namely, the evolutionary view of Israel's history and religion. This theory is essential to that view. It is true enough, as sometimes urged by those who hold the evolutionary view of Israel's history and religion, that the evolutionary theory has provision for ebb and flow and for eddies and that any given cataclysmic events in human history, which are actually found, do not necessarily overthrow the theory of evolution in history. But the use of this principle of the theory of evolution is only practicable in the examination of accepted facts. When it is proposed to reject the only known statement of facts as incorrect and to proceed to a reconstruction, as in the case of the early history of Israel, or when it is proposed to construct history for a period that is blank or very obscure in human annals, then this device of the evolutionary theory for meeting emergencies becomes impracticable. *Nobody knows where to put in the eddies.* Attempts to put them in are either guesswork or, worse, the arbitrary placing of them to sustain a preconceived theory. The Bible account on its face presents what would be, according to the evolutionary theory of Israel's history, a flow in the current of human history. But it does not suit the advocates of that theory to have a flow of the tide at that place, so they have insisted upon a semi-barbarous condition of Palestine with universally low religious ideas among the patriarchs as the proper

history for that period. Thus, as Dr. Orr well says at this point, "the criticism rests upon the theory, not the theory on the criticism."[1] So, as has been stated, the theory of the semi-barbarous condition of patriarchal Palestine is essential to the evolutionary view of Israel's history.

But let us see exactly how advocates of this view of Israel's history put the case for patriarchal Palestine. Kuenen, in speaking of the more important objections to the historical character of the patriarchal narratives, says: "They are taken, in the first place, from the religious ideas which are ascribed to the patriarchs. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are not only the servants of Jehovah, but are also not inferior to the prophets of the VIIIth century B.C. in pureness of religious insight and inward spiritual piety. I must crave permission to assume here provisionally what will be proved further on, that this representation is utterly without foundation in history."[2]

Nor can it be said that this is a theory held only by earlier critics but entirely abandoned now. Professor George Adam Smith, in reply to Professor Eerdmans, who combats the nomadic view of the patriarchal life, thinks that against any considerable advancement in civilization in the patriarchal life may be noted "the fact that the Israelites during their long residence on the borders of Egypt were not at all influenced by the Egyptian civilization" [!] and that "even if Dr. Eerdmans' appreciation of the evidence of the narratives were accepted, namely, that they imply the most advanced steps of the semi-nomadic stage, the question is still to be faced whether these features of the narra-

tive are not (as Professor Robertson Smith, and the other scholars whom he names, maintain) reflections from the monarchical period of Israel's history when the myths, the traditions of the patriarchs, and "the book of the Covenant" received their literary form, whatsoever more ancient elements they may embody."[1] This theory of civilization and culture in Palestine of patriarchal times, though of far less importance to some other critics, has been held, as a matter of fact, by nearly all, as well as adopted by all commentators, and very inconsistently indeed, even by those who have at the same time held to the historicity of the Biblical account of the life story and the religious culture of the patriarchs.

The theory is now completely gone by the board. There has been in the last few years a revolution in the minds of archæologists concerning the civilization of Palestine in the patriarchal age. There have been, indeed, some feeble attempts to explain away this revolution, attempts comparable to those made by some would-be historians in these days to explain away the American Revolution of 1776. It is to be hoped that, ere long, those who are so wrapped around with the folds of their critical theories as to be impervious to any light from without, if there be yet any such, will at least *hear* enough of what is going on to induce them to come out and see for themselves. Sellin[2] found the earliest wall and cistern-work at Taanach, dating from a period before the Exodus, to be the best of all in that vast ruin of two millenniums of human history, and, in itself considered, compared with such work by Romans and by moderns, really

of a very superior character. The engineering skill on the defenses at Gezer[1] was of a high order, while that on the waterworks, which was able to locate a hidden spring far below the city, direct the location of an opening within the walls, guide the workmen to drive a twenty-eight-foot tunnel obliquely down through solid rock a distance of ninety-six feet to the exact source of the water, though it will not rank in magnitude and in romantic elements with the boring of a spiral tunnel from both sides to meet in the middle of the Alps or from the east bank and the west bank of the Hudson to meet under the middle of the river, is yet of exactly the same kind of skill. In the words of one scholar,[2] one of the most acute and candid of archæological thinkers, "Obviously, we are far from the centuries of barbarism, and thus the discovery impinges upon those religious problems with which modern thinkers are occupied."

The distinguishing characteristic of Egyptian art is its graphic character, the ability of its artists to convey exact ideas of the objects depicted. They are fettered by many conventionalities which mar their work, but they are cartoonists of the first rank. This gives us valuable assistance in understanding the civilization and culture of the peoples they depict. In the tomb of Anta at Deshasha[3] an attack upon a Canaanite city is pictured. The Egyptian soldiers are seen raising a scaling ladder to the top of the wall of a beleagured city. A comparison between the length of the ladder and the height of the men raising it shows it to be between forty and forty-five feet long. So the alarming description given by the spies[4] of cities walled up

to heaven becomes not a frightened exaggeration, but rather a sober statement, when we set beside it the well-known fact that, visually, the atmospheric heavens seem to all of us to be just above the top of the highest familiar objects until we are otherwise instructed. The report of the spies was a description, in popular language of the day, of the exact state of things in Canaan.

Last of all, the richest booty which Thothmes III describes at Karnak,[1] in his account of a Palestinian raid, agrees exactly in its representation of luxurious refinement with the evidence of the civilization of that age furnished by these examples of engineering skill. Chariots plated with gold or chased with silver, chairs of cedar and ebony inlaid or gilded with gold, a sword of bronze and a helmet of gold inlaid with lapis lazuli, and richly embroidered stuffs. These antiquities could not now be duplicated from all the museums in the world.

All these things in addition to the mass of evidence against the ignorance of the patriarchal age, *i.e.*, refinement in things intellectual, overwhelmingly sustains the opinion of Professor W. Max Müller, vigorously expressed in discussion in the American Oriental Society 1909, that "the civilization of Palestine in the patriarchal age was fully equal to that of Egypt."

Such a civilization removes, as much as civilization can, the difficulties in the way of high moral and religious ideas. It does not provide for such ideas, but it is quite sufficient to discredit the evolutionary theory of Israel's history at this point. The assumption that the patriarchs could have no higher moral and religious ideas than those about them is the fundamental and

essential assumption of the evolutionary theory of revelation, an assumption which requires that the revelation must always be from within mankind and never is truly external and objective. The Bible narrative plainly ascribes high moral and religious ideas to the patriarchs. Thus the theory necessitates a reconstruction of the narrative. But this necessity of the theory is no evidence of the correctness of the reconstruction. There is as yet no archæological evidence of these high moral and religious ideas during the patriarchal age, but the abundant evidence of the introduction of such ideas at the period of the conquest just at the close of the patriarchal age raises a very strong presumption in favor of the moral and religious ideas attributed by the Bible to the patriarchs. This part of the subject is of sufficient importance to receive here separate consideration.

3. *The theory of the evolution of Israel's religious history chiefly from a Palestinian origin and environment.* The comparative study of religions is a very interesting and helpful auxiliary branch of theology. It is quite permissible, indeed, to classify the religion of the Bible among other religions in such scientific study. But to conclude that all religions thus classifiable are alike in origin, in growth, and in authority is as unscientific as to conclude that all schools of painting are alike in inception, attainment, and value because their works can be systematically arranged in the same art gallery and classified in the same technical work on art; or to conclude that all birds—robins, blue jays, and buzzards —have equal claim upon our admiration because they are arranged in orderly cages in the zoölogical garden

and described systematically with beautifully illuminated plates in the same scientific work on ornithology. Classification is made, and can only be made, by means of resemblances and differences, as much by *differences* as by resemblances, and, indeed, according to some one *chosen* principle of comparison. Thus classification is not conclusive as to source or course or meaning, and sometimes reveals little or nothing on any of these subjects. All depends upon the principle of comparison which may have been selected, and it is itself a presupposition in the mind of the investigator. The yield of the process of classification is that of the prestidigitator who gets out of the box exactly what he puts into it and nothing more. What a mess a student of comparative religion in the year 4000 A.D., by the method now used in this evolutionary theory of the development of Israel's religion, will make of the religious history of the Hawaiian Islands, or of Madagascar, or of Uganda in this year of our Lord 1924, without knowledge of the work of the Christian missionaries! Having postulated the evolutionary principle as governing all change, and having classified all things by resemblances and differences, what a delightful experience he will have getting the Christianity of the present day out of the horrible and revolting heathenism of these lands! So with the study of the religion of Israel. What if there has been some message from without, some divine missionary from above to this world of sin in the days of old? Is there anything in the processes of the science of comparative religion under the guidance of the principle of evolution to discover it? Does not evolution, the adopted principle

of change in that study, forbid the discovery of it? And, if in any way it be discovered, is it not a troublesome abnormality? At this point the comparative study of religions, as at present conducted, breaks down utterly. In fact, its advocates have overworked it, have asked it to carry burdens for which it is not fitted, to do work it cannot do.

Kuenen says: "To what one may call the universal, or at least, the common theory, that religion begins with fetishism, then develops into polytheism, and then, but not before, ascends to monotheism—that is to say, if this highest stage be reached—to this rule the Semites are no exception."[1] Thus it is proposed through the use of the methods of the comparative study of religions to account for everything in the religion of the Bible, and that without inquiring whether or not there were any missionaries; indeed, on the contrary, by postulating among the presuppositions evolution as the dominant principle of change, and by assuming that there were no missionaries and no message from without. One might as well try to account for our present progress in mechanical things without the inventor.

But the facts as brought to light by archæological research are against this application of the method of the comparative study of religions. One could as easily make the fetishism of East Africa cross over the line at the year 1890 and produce the Christianity of Uganda in the year 1924 as make the revolting religion of Gezer pass the line of the conquest period and produce the religious practices and religious spirit of the centuries following. The bones of children under

foundations there and the collection of burials of little children under eight days of age without the intermingling of other burials, and near the sacred place, is horrible in its suggestiveness. Little ones do not, from natural causes, all die at such an age and be buried together by themselves at the place of sacrifice. From this nightmare of child sacrifice, probably of the first-born, the most degraded and degrading of all revolting worship in the world, we turn, as from darkness to dawn, toward the religious conditions and religious spirit following the conquest period. Did the darkness develop the dawn? We note at once the rapid decline of this horrible child sacrifice, and, not instead of it, but contemporaneous with its decline, the appearance of the beautiful symbolism of the extinguished lamp between two bowls in the burials of the Jewish period. Are these the indications of a religion that came up, or of a religion that came down? It was of these things that Professor George Adam Smith said: "Mr. Macalister's researches are not more illustrative in anything than in the exhibition they afford of the primitive religious customs which Israel encountered upon their entry into Palestine, and which persisted in the form of idolatry and the moral abominations that usually accompanied this up to the very end of the history of Israel upon the land. He has shown us upon this single site the Canaanite idolatry in all its force, in all its consequences upon life, and, as we can guess, its consequences upon character; and he has shown us besides how constant were the pressure and example of Egypt upon this part of the land at least, and how frequent were the pressure and example of

another great heathen power—Assyria—and how, finally, Hellenism came in and added to these other heathen forces one more within the compass of that small territory on which Israel was settled. We realize, then, through work like Mr. Macalister's what the purer religion of Israel had to contend with—what it had to struggle against all that time . . . We have been told that monotheism was the natural offspring of desert scenery and of desert life. But it was not in the desert that Israel's monotheism developed and grew strong and reached its pure forms. It was in this land of Palestine, of which Gezer, with its many centuries and its many forms of idolatry, is so typical an instance. When we contemplate all these systems—specimens of which Mr. Macalister's work brings home to us—when we contemplate these systems, we are surely the more amazed at the survival, under their pressure and against their cruelty, of a so much higher and an ethical religion. Surely it is only a divine purpose, it is only the inspiration of the Most High which has been the cause."[1]

4. There has been a general application of the *theory of anachronisms* by many critics to the traditional view of Scripture; indeed, to the Scripture's own view of itself, when taken at its face value. It has been asserted that there is in Scripture a systematic representation of earlier events in a light only furnished by much later times and the throwing back of peoples and events to places much too early in the history of the world.

Fripp says: "The legend of Abraham and Lot culminates in the story of Lot's daughters. To what period shall we assign the national animosity reflected here?

. . . . We should not be far wrong in ascribing that story of Lot's daughters to a period soon after Moab's revolt against Ahaziah when the contempt of David's reign for the old border enemies had changed into fierce hatred."[1] Robertson says: "Similarly the stories of Jacob and Laban reflected the international relationships. On Israel's N. E. border was Aram . . . . The powerful Omri, whose fame is preserved in Assyrian and Moabite inscriptions, put him (Aram) to a kind of tribute (Genesis xx, 34) and Ahab, if we are to believe similar records, had to supply him with a contingent against a new and yet more terrible enemy in the far East. Hence the legend of Jacob's respect for his father-in-law."[2]

This theory of the general anachronistic character of the early history in the Bible is so bound up together with the theory of the ignorance of the patriarchal days, the theory of the semi-barbarous condition of Palestine in patriarchal times, and the theory of the evolution of Israel's later civilization and culture out of these low beginnings, that, with the refutation of those theories scarcely anything needs to be said in reply to this. It cannot be successfully maintained without their support and must soon of necessity fail without them. For when the light supposed to belong only to later times is found to belong in good measure to those earlier times, the motive as well as the opportunity for alleging anachronisms is taken away.

But this failure of the theory of general anachronism in early Bible history does not prevent the alleging of special instances of anachronism, each of which must be considered on its own merits.

Edom, for example, has been said to be mentioned too early in the narrative.[1] Von Bohlen says: "The Pentateuch contains many allusions to later events more especially in those having reference to some of the neighboring nations, from which all the hostile fabrications of Genesis concerning the Phœnicians, the Edomites, the Moabites, and others would seem to have been subsequently derived."[2] But the Egyptian papyrus Anastasia represents an officer of Seti Meremptah II of the XIXth dynasty, about the time of the Exodus, as saying in an official report to the government that the people of Edom desired to pasture their flocks in Goshen. They had thus early found their way clear across the Sinai peninsula, which argues their number and importance at that early age. Müller says: "An officer reported concerning the permission 'that the Bedouin tribe of the Edomites passed the frontier guard near Thuku (Succoth) to the lakes of Pithom of Meremptah in Thuku, in order to pasture their beasts upon the land of Pharaoh.' We perceive from this the great age and wide dispersion of the Edomite tribes."[3]

Chabas also identified the name Edom in the story of the travels of Sinuhit who lived away back in the XIIth dynasty. The identification is not so sure as that in the papyrus Anastasia, but is yet probably correct.[4]

Moab was long unidentified, indeed, up to very recent times, was unknown outside of the Bible until far down the stream of history, and doubt was cast upon its existence at so early a time as its first mention in the Bible. But Moab also has been identified.[5]

Property of
Catourette Library
WCIU

It occurs in an inscription of Rameses II around the base of the third great statue west of the gateway of the north pylon of the temple of Luxor. The inscription records events near the time of the Exodus. The name Moab in the inscription is identified beyond all question. Comparatively few foreign names are so clearly and unmistakably written in Egyptian. Examination of the list of names in which it occurs and of the account of the expedition to which its subjugation is attributed, clearly places Moab in Ruthen, the Egyptian name for Syria and Palestine and northern and western Arabia.

So frequently has the charge of anachronism been refuted by archæology that it is not now so often heard as formerly.

CHAPTER IX

Theories Affecting the Integrity or Historicity of Scripture—Continued

The most important of all the theories advanced by criticism affecting the integrity or historicity of Scripture yet remains to be examined:

5. *The theory of the mythical or legendary character of the early narratives of the Bible.* One of the assumptions of the comparative study of religions by the popular evolutionary method, if put into syllogistic form, runs thus; Myths are found as an embellishment in the color scheme of nearly all ancient religions; the Bible contains one of the ancient religions: *ergo*, the early narratives of the Bible are myths. Of course, the advocates of this mythical theory never themselves put it thus into the strait-jacket of formal logic. If they did, they would immediately reject it. Yet this is the exact logical form of the assumption of myths in early Bible history, or of the argumentation, if one may dignify it with such a name, which concludes that things which may be classified together according to one principle of comparison are alike in other respects. Notwithstanding the illogical method of such reasoning, the mythical character of the early portions of the Bible has had ardent advocates, partly from their overlooking this formal fallacy and partly from a belief on their part that there is archæological evidence to sustain such a theory.

This mythical view is clearly presented by Schultz in this passage: "The result may be given in outline as follows: Genesis is the book of sacred legend, with a mythical introduction. The first three chapters of it, in particular, present us with revelation-myths of the most important kind, and the following eight with mythical elements that have been recast more in the form of legend. From Abraham to Moses we have national legend pure and simple, mixed with a variety of mythical elements which have become almost unrecognizable. From Moses to David we have history still mixed with a great deal of the legendary, and even partly with mythical elements that are no longer distinguishable. From David onward we have history with no more legendary elements in it than are everywhere present in history as written by the ancients."[1]

Certainly it will be conceded that the examination of the facts in each case of alleged myth in the Bible, as these facts are made known to us by archæological research, will be a fair way to test this theory of the mythical character of early Old Testament history.[2]

The record of the four kings in Genesis xiv has been the object of most persistent attacks for the purpose of demonstrating the mythical character of the narrative. The kings have been called "petty sheiks of the desert," and their names "etymological inventions," and the general historicity of the narrative thoroughly discredited by many. Nöldeke argued most elaborately for the untrustworthiness of the Biblical narrative at this point. As his criticism of the account of the invasion by the four kings will come up later for more complete presentment,[3] very brief references

to it will suffice here. In his *Untersuchungen*[1] by a long process of argumentation he arrives at the conclusion that this portion of the history in Genesis xiv, is a "free creation throughout," and the personality of Melchizedek he etherealizes into a "poetic figure."

This view of the story of the four kings thus so prominently set forth in the early history of criticism by Nöldeke has been carried forward and has held its place down along the whole course of the critical discussion, and is even held by some to this day.

Wellhausen refers to this view of Nöldeke with such approval that he thinks the historicity of the narrative "seems to have received its death-blow from him." "Nöldeke's criticism (of Genesis xiv) remains unshaken and unassailable: that four kings from the Persian Gulf should, 'in the time of Abraham' have made an incursion into the Sinaitic Peninsula, that they should have on this occasion attacked five kinglets on the Dead Sea littoral and have carried them off prisoners, and finally that Abraham should have set out in pursuit of the retreating victors, accompanied by three hundred and eighteen men-servants, and have forced them to disgorge their prey—all these incidents are sheer impossibilities. They are not the more trustworthy from the fact that they are with shrewd premeditation placed in a world which had passed away."[2]

Delitzsch in his *Genesis* gives a very comprehensive summary of opinions concerning the fourteenth chapter of Genesis which is in part as follows: "Ed. Meyer is of like opinion [with Nöldeke] only that he expresses himself much more depreciatingly. Hitzig sees in the expedition of Chedorlaomer which falls in a fourteenth

year, a reflection thrown back into antiquity from 2 Kings xviii, 13, and explains chapter xiv in general as later tradition, which could first be protrayed in the condition set forth after that Salem was made holy through the manifestation of Jehovah . . . . Between such race-legend and literary romance is only a wavering border-line.

"The new Pentateuchal criticism which takes its first impulse from Reuss, considers chapter xiv as one of the youngest parts of Genesis, first incorporated in the latest redaction, upon which the expression uttered concerning Melchizedek 'without father, without mother, without descent,' is permitted to cling. And Ed. Meyer goes further and concludes that the particulars of the account are completely unhistorical."[1]

Eduard Meyer, in his *Geschichte des Alterthums*, has this striking passage: "Concerning this extension of the Elamite power, we have additional knowledge from an entirely different source. In the Pentateuch, Genesis xiv, an account is presented which uses not any of the written sources employed elsewhere, but manifestly is taken out of an elsewhere unheard-of book of legends (like *e.g.*, Judges xix, 21). According to language and content it can at the earliest have been composed in or after the Babylonian exile. . . . . That that late phantasy is without any historical content does not need to be said."[2]

Jeremias, in his account of Sodom and Gomorrah, is filled with the mythological idea of what he calls the "deluge of fire," claiming the story to be an imitation of the account of the great Deluge. He says: "In the whole account of the judgment upon Sodom

and Gomorrah as it is presented, adheres the motive of a deluge of fire which the history sets in contrast with the Deluge.

"(1) The destruction comes upon Sodom and Gomorrah, which once resembled paradise (xiii, 10; 'like Egypt' is a gloss) on account of the misdeeds of men.

"(2) A just man with his family is saved, as Noah was rescued in the Deluge.

"(3) A mountain is assigned as a refuge, (xix, 17) in reality the refuge is the city Zoar.

"(4) The one chosen for salvation is laughed at.

"(5) The just God is importuned that he should only strike the evil doer with the judgment (xviii, 25)"[1]

Professor Barton, in an elaborate and learned discussion of *Abraham and Archæology*, says: "Archæology so far from having as yet established the early composition and historical character of Genesis xiv, seems, so far as I can see, to furnish a series of facts which are best explained by supposing that that chapter was composed by a late midrashic writer who had, it is true, access to some Babylonian data, partly late and partly early, but did not know how to use them. He lived so far from the times that he had lost in part the correct historical perspective. Archæology thus confirms the critical results reached by Kuenen, Wellhausen, Cornill, Budde, Bacon, Briggs, Wideboer, Ball, Carpenter, and Harford-Battersby."[2]

But the four kings have arisen from the dead in archæological history. There is still some dispute about the identification of certain of them, but the confederation has appeared in Babylonian history of that time; and such a suzerainty over Palestine as is implied

in the narrative of Genesis xiv, is established beyond reasonable question. The evidence in full to sustain this opinion is too long, technical, and involved to be given here, but may be seen by consulting the references given below.[1] The conclusions at which distinguished Assyriologists have arrived may be given here. Hommel says: "The narrative in Genesis xiv differs in some of its details not only from the account which we glean from contemporary inscriptions, but also—and to a far greater extent—from the later Babylonian tradition; it introduces into the history of Hammurabi as presented in the ancient monuments an entirely new episode (concerning Melchizedek) which fits into the political circumstances of the period like a missing fragment, and thus completes, and throws a most valuable light on, the knowledge of this remote epoch which we gather from the cuneiform records. The theory that the names of the kings, together with the fact that Chedorlaomer had once led an expedition into 'the countries of the West,' were transferred from Babylonian records in *post-exilic* times, and that a campaign on the part of the four allied kings as far as Ailat and Kadesh-barnea was then *invented*, is absolutely inadmissable. The material handed down to us in Genesis xiv is neither more nor less than genuine and ancient tradition."[2]

Professor Clay sums up his opinion thus: "In the light of what has been discovered, Professor Nöldeke and his line of followers naturally have changed a few of their views. Certain scholars now seem to think that, as some of these theories are no longer held, by reason of what is now known, there is no

longer any occasion to refer to them. But inasmuch as a large number are still maintained, some of which are exceedingly far reaching, and are based on highly insufficient grounds or, in fact, no data whatever, the general public has a right to know what has become of the others which were advanced by scholars of repute, as well as to consider the theories which are still promulgated.

"Weighing carefully the position taken by the critics in the light of what has been revealed through the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions, we find that the very foundations upon which their theories rest, with reference to the points that could be tested, totally disappear. The truth is that wherever any light has been thrown upon the subject through the excavations, their hypotheses have invariably been found wanting. Moreover, what remains of their theories is based upon purely speculative grounds."[1]

In view of all these facts and opinions, the man who now dared to call the four kings "petty sheiks of the desert" or their names "etymological inventions" would be an object of ridicule. A place in history is found for these kings; and, though all is not yet known concerning them, they have ceased to be objects of reasonable suspicion. What exactly may be their historical character and importance is yet a legitimate subject for discusson, not so, any longer, the question of their legendary or mythical character. The importance of the XIVth Chapter in the narrative is plainly its importance in redemption history; the comparative unimportance of the epoch in world history will at once appear upon a careful study of the geography of the whole campaign of the four kings.

The Hittites, also, have come in for a good share of suspicion in the search for legends and myths in the early Bible history. On the projecting wing of the south wall of the temple of Amen at Karnak, is found the Egyptian copy of a great treaty of peace between Rameses II and Kheta.[2] This inscription has long been known, and believed by many to refer to the Hittites, so frequently mentioned in the Bible; but until the reading of this inscription and one by Seti I, the father of Rameses II, a little earlier,[3] they were known nowhere else in literature, except where drawn from the account in the Bible.

Later, Babylonian inscriptions from the early dynasties[1] onward and the Tell Amarna letters from Palestine mention a people called the "Khatti." Here, also, there was thought by many, perhaps most, scholars to be a reference to the mysterious Hittites of the Biblical narrative.[2]

But grave doubts had been raised by critics and archæologists concerning this identification. Some had even gone so far as to say, though not often for publication, that "no such people as the Hittites ever existed." Budge, in his *History of Egypt*, says: "The Kheta, who are, no doubt, the people referred to by the Assyrians under the name of Khatti, have been identified with the Hittites of Holy Scripture, but on insufficient grounds,"[3] and again, "In passing it must be stated that the commonly accepted identification of the Kheta with the Hittites of the Bible is as yet unproved, since it rests only upon the similarity between the Hebrew name Heth, and the Egyptian name Kheta."[4]

The inhabitants of old Troy were no more in need of a Schliemann to justify their claim to a right of real existence and a place in history than the Hittites were of some friendly discoverer to deliver them from the serious suspicion of—to say the least—legendary accretions of character, if not even of unreality. In 1906 the deliverer came. Winckler[1] uncovered the ruins at Boghatz-keui and brought to light, in addition to architectural ruins and a treasury of inscriptions in Hittite hieroglyphs, also tablets in cuneiform script. Among these latter was found the Hittite copy of the same treaty of peace between Rameses II and the "Kheta." What these tablets, now being translated and carefully studied, may yet reveal concerning the Hittites and what vast and amazing additions to learning may come with the decipherment of the Hittite hieroglyphs themselves, an event which certainly cannot much longer be delayed, no one can tell. Already there is this important result: no one is saying now that "no such people as the Hittites ever existed."

So one by one the so-called myths and legends of the Bible are being given their place in sober history, and the ghostly heroes are walking in common flesh and blood among the other real heroes of life. As this process goes on (and the list of illustrations might be extended to nearly every patriarchal narrative) there is being supplied that complete historical setting in which the narratives of the Bible fit with perfect naturalness. But legends and myths do not receive such confirmation and do not so fit into an historical setting. That they do not do so is one of the characteristics which mark them as myths or legends.

That the very persons and events described in the narrative have not in every case been found has very little of the importance sometimes attributed to that fact. Driver discussing the expedition of the four kings, Genesis xiv, says:[1] "Nöldeke never questioned . . . the general possibility at this time of an expedition being sent from the far East into Palestine [which, however, Nöldeke did question].[2] His argument consisted in pointing out various historical improbabilities attaching to the details of a *particular* expedition; and archæology can overthrow this argument only by producing evidence that this expedition, *with the details as stated in Genesis xiv*, actually took place. And this, up to the present time (June, 1909) archæology has not done." Surely to overthrow such an argument it is only necessary to supply such historical setting as will relieve the "improbabilities" to which Driver refers. These "improbabilities" have been relieved, as we have seen.

Such objections to the inadequacy of archæological evidence because of the failure to produce individual persons and events, when such complete historical setting is furnished as removes every suspicion of improbability from the narrative, too much resemble attempts, so often made in our courts, (and alas! too often successfully made) to carry a case upon some technicality, when it is impossible to raise a doubt in the mind of either judge, jury, or the public concerning the main issue.

Considering the countless millions of persons and events in those ancient millenniums, the wonder is that, among the comparatively small number mentioned

in the Bible, any of them should have appeared in archæological research. If none of them did ever appear, that of itself would not make the narratives incredible or even improbable. It is quite enough to make the stories believable and to distinguish them unerringly from any reasonable charge of being myths or legends, that the historical setting into which they exactly fit has been provided by the results of archæological research. These results do not of themselves prove the events or the persons, but they do remove them from the category of suspects. To demand more than this as a condition of credibility is as unreasonable as it would be to demand proof that the battle of Santiago is not a myth, because it has not yet been possible to settle conclusively who was the hero of that battle, or to determine with certainty whether or not a certain distinguished admiral was in the battle at all.

Historical inquiry and discussion concerning the early narratives of the Bible is quite legitimate, but in the light which archæological research has shed upon that historical period providing suitable historical setting for the Biblical narratives, mythical or legendary theories would not seem any longer to have a standing in the discussion. Yet Gunkel thinks[1] that "the narrative (*i.e.*, of the four kings and Abram) contains also in the most striking contrast things well worthy of faith and things quite impossible."

Very different is the view of Ladd concerning the historicity of Old Testament narratives. "Jesus Christ is an historical verity: the facts of His presence, His life, His death, are matters of primary concernment

and peerless value and His relations with the Old Testament religion, its history, its predictions, its ethico-religious truths, are historical facts. And this Old Testament religion, with which He places Himself in such relations, is preëminently an historical affair. However misty are its historical origins, however doubtful are the precise arrangement which we must make of many of its principal facts, the religion, in all that circuit of truth within which these relations of Jesus are comprised, is an historical fact . . . What could be the conceivable nature of a revealed religion without a record of facts?"[1] Indeed, if there be not this "record of facts" in Old Testament history, there is no religion there that is "revealed" in any objective sense.

It seems to be in order now to complete this part of the discussion that we should consider:

II. CRITICAL THEORIES ATTACKING THE INTEGRITY OR HISTORICITY OF SCRIPTURE WHICH HAVE BEEN CORROBORATED

There are no well-authenticated instances of the corroboration of such theories. Instances thought by some to be of this character are thought by others to admit of entirely reasonable interpretation consistent with the integrity and historicity of Scripture. It has sometimes been announced at the discovery of some interesting piece of archæological evidence, thought to bear upon Biblical questions, that some critical theory discrediting the Biblical account is finally corroborated and put beyond dispute, but eventually it has always turned out either that the evidence could not be produced or that it did not bear at the point claimed.

It has often been said also, as already noted,[1] that some critical theories, even those discrediting the historicity of some portion of Scripture, have been fully sustained by archæology. It would extend this book beyond reasonable limits to take up each such case and show, by examination of the evidence, that it is not sustained by it. Nor is it necessary so to do. It may be fairly assumed, as it is freely admitted, that reasonable and intellectually honest men are on both sides of the Biblical controversies. All may not be such on either side, but nearly all are of this character. No such point in the discussion as those now being considered can be said to be fully sustained until the evidence is of such character as to convince candid and reasonable men generally on both sides of the controversy who have examined the evidence. The instances of theories against the historicity of the Bible which have been discredited, as noted in the preceding pages, will bear this test. When any such theories have been corroborated finally by archæological evidence that fact also will be conceded generally by reasonable scholars who have examined the evidence, even by those who have opposed such theories. There are no instances of this kind.

CHAPTER X

Critical Theories of Scripture Just Now Challenged

In one respect every presentation of the current Biblical discussions must be unsatisfactory. There is never a time, and nowhere a place, that it is possible to present a complete review of these discussions, for there is no intermission and no common halting place. Critical opinion, like all things in the philosophy of Heraclitus, is always in a state of flux; and critics, like the Athenians, are always ready—to "hear or to tell some new thing." So there are always important points in critical controversies which are challenged and upon which judgment must be suspended. We will here in THE THIRD PLACE TAKE up some of these CRITICAL THEORIES JUST NOW CHALLENGED.

Some theories long held and generally considered well established, are now challenged in the name of archæology. Whether or not the challenges will be ultimately sustained cannot, as yet, be determined, though, in some cases, there can be little doubt of the issue.

It would be a waste of time to consider here all of the unsettled questions of archæology and criticism. But a few important critical theories now challenged by archæology, the challenges of which, if they be finally sustained, will have a far-reaching effect upon criticism, may well be presented just as they are now in a still problematic state.

I. BABYLONIAN ORIGINS IN CRITICISM

The Babylonian origin and westward course of early Semitic tradition and culture, especially religious tradition and culture, has been long and almost, if not quite, universally held. Indeed, nearly every critical work, since the recognition of the literary character of the early Babylonian civilization, has been written from the standpoint of this theory. And in spite of wide divergence in theological views, in critical presuppositions, and in results and conclusions, practically every critic of all schools and all the archæologists as well, have argued, or more often postulated, the Babylonian origin and westward course of Semitic culture and tradition. It is hardly necessary to cite references when they are on every hand, but a few definite statements of the case by various authors may profitably be considered.

Professor Barton concludes "that we must hold to an Arabic origin of the Semites. . . . The northern Semites—the Babylonians, the Arameans, and Canaanites—first separated from their brethren in the South and settled in Babylonia and the neighboring regions, where they lived together for a long period. The Arameans were the first to separate from the main body of emigrants; at a considerably later period the Canaanites, and, last of all, the Assyrians."[1] Dr. Orr says: "The transformation of opinion [from a still earlier view] has been revolutionary. The entire perspective is altered, and it is felt that Israel is now rather to be regarded as a people upon whom the ends of the earth had come in respect of civilization. The world was already old in the times of Jacob and Moses, and

the tendency is now to see in the religious ideas and institutions of Israel an inheritance from Babylonia, and to bring in Babylonian influence at the beginning of Israel's history, rather than at its close. The gain is appreciable in the breaking up of older critical theories, but the attempt to ignore the distinctive features of the Biblical religion, and to resolve the latter into a simple compound of the ideas of other religions, is bound to fail, and is being met with an effective protest from critical scholars themselves."[1]

This theory of the Babylonian origin and westward course of Semitic culture has been mildly criticized and even questioned for some time and is now boldly challenged, not with any idea of a return to the former view, but of going still farther back for a viewpoint, putting Palestine, if not at the dawn of Semitic culture, at least at an earlier point in it than the rise of Babylonian culture. Professor Clay[2] formulates the new view on the subject which has been crystallizing for some time, and gives it to the world with the addition of some most valuable material of his own. He says: "The current theory of Semitic scholars concerning the origin of the Semitic Babylonians is that they came from Arabia, and that after their culture had developed in Babylonia it was carried westward into Amurru (*i.e.*, Palestine and Syria) generally known as the land of the Amorites.

"Without attempting to determine the ultimate origin of the Semites, the writer holds that every indication, resulting from his investigations, proves that the movement of the Semites was eastward from Amurru

and Aram (*i.e.*, from the lands of the West) into Babylonia. In other words, the culture of the Semitic Babylonians points, if not to its origin, at least to a long development in Amurru before it was carried into Babylonia."[1]

Again, in discussing the worship of Jehovah, he says: "In considering these different facts in connection with the name and worship of Yahweh, it seems that the Kenite, the Babylonian, the Canaanite, and all other theories must give way to that which is gathered from the Old Testament, namely, that the worship of Yahweh came from the country of the ancestors of Abram, the Aramaean. Recent discoveries thus furnish a greater antiquity for things Biblical than is usually accorded to them, and point to the ancestral home of Abram, *i.e.*, Aram, which was identified closely with Amurra, instead of Babylonia, as the source of Israel's culture."

"It is necessary, therefore, to differ radically from even those who, like Professor Rodgers, say that 'the first eleven chapters of Genesis in their present form, as also in the original documents into which modern critical research has traced their origin, bear eloquent witness to Babylonia as the old home of the Hebrew people, and of their collection of sacred stories.' But, let me add, in appreciation of what the same writer says, even when he includes those elements which he thinks were borrowed from the Babylonians: 'When all these are added up and placed together, they are small in number and insignificant in size when compared with all the length and breadth and height of

Israel's literature.' But the writer ventures to go even farther and to claim that the influence of Babylonian culture upon the peoples of Canaan was almost *nil.*"

"The story of Babel in Genesis at this point becomes especially interesting; for in it we may see a reflection as handed down by the Biblical writer of the movement of the Semites from the West, who made Babel a prominent center. 'As they journeyed East, they found a plain in the land of Shinar.' Here these mountaineers used 'brick instead of stone' to which they had been accustomed in their native land; and 'bitumen' instead of 'mortar.' This became naturally a city sacred to their chief deity, *Amar*, whose name the Sumerian scribes wrote in the cuneiform script, Amar-uduk."[1]

In later publication Professor Clay has advanced his thesis to claim evidence for an Amorite Empire along the West Coast of Canaan and Syria and his whole Amorite Theory is gaining adherence from scholars.[2]

Thus Amurru, Syria and Palestine, is declared to be the home of the northern Semite; if not the original home, at least an earlier home than Babylonia. Thus the course of Semitic culture was from west to east rather than from east to west. This proposes a complete "right-about-face" in the whole critical discussion of the early portions of the Bible. Just what the ultimate effect upon various critical views will be if this theory is sustained, it is impossible to say. The immediate practical effect of its adoption would seem to be to put on the shelf everything written from the old viewpoint and to cause the rewriting of criticism

from the new viewpoint. Farther than this, it is impossible to see. Whether the influence of this theory would be in the direction of more conservative views, or in the opposite direction, can only be known by its adoption and application, if it finds final acceptance.

II. THE GRADUAL INVASION OF PALESTINE

It will not be disrespectful to the advocates of the evolutionary theory of Israel's history, and especially religious culture, out of a Palestinian origin and environment to say that their theory demands the gradual invasion of Palestine. Though distinguished advocates of that theory are ready enough to admit that there are ebbs and flows and eddies in the process of evolution, yet since no one can tell where to put them in this case and, indeed, since any such sudden and radical interruption as a conquest would fatally break with the source and environment out of which the culture is said to have come, it becomes necessary to assume a gradual invasion instead of the conquest recorded in the Bible. Archæological investigation of the facts in the case, but recently begun, is as yet quite incomplete and the outcome can only yet be said to be fairly evident. The advocates of the theory of a gradual invasion have been able in many cases to make out what is to themselves, at least, a fairly satisfactory account of the discoveries consistent with their theories. Yet a full review of the facts seems very sharply to challenge that theory. A kind of archæological book of Joshua is being constructed to be laid along side of the Joshua of Scripture. The parallel is exceedingly interesting. It is only necessary to compare sharply the

record in the two books to see with reasonable clearness the outcome. That some have not seen it is due largely to the fact that they have first torn the Biblical Joshua into fragments, each piece of which, being incomplete in itself is quite probably not in entire harmony with the facts of archæology. Such fragments certainly would not be consistent with the facts in the case, if the book should prove to be, as it purports to be, one consistent and truthful account. That the results of the excavations do not sustain the statements of the "P document" as is claimed by the advocates of the critical analysis of Joshua, is apparent enough; but if they are found to be entirely consistent with the unmutilated Bible account found in Joshua, it will seem to most unprejudiced minds that the interrogation point should be placed after the "P document" rather than after the Biblical account of the conquest.

Now as to the facts in the case: exactly what change in culture is represented in the written book of Joshua as the author of that book intended us to view it, and how much in this archæological book of Joshua which is in the making from the discoveries? How much of a break in culture is required by the Biblical account, and how much is shown by the excavations? An answer to this question by the author in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* may be quoted here. Since the Israelites occupied the cities and towns and vineyards and olive orchards of the Canaanites, and their "houses, full of all good things," had the same materials, and in the main the same purposes, for pottery, and would adopt methods of cooking suited to the country; spoke the

"language of Canaan," and were of the same race as many of its people, intermarried, though against their law, with the people of the land, and were continually chided for lapses into the idolatry and superstitious practices of the Canaanities, and, in short, were greatly different from them only in religion, it is evident that the only marked, immediate change to be expected at the conquest is a change in religion, and that any other break in culture occasioned by the devastation of war will be only a break in continuance of the same kind of culture, evidence of demolition, spoliation, and reconstruction. Exactly such change in religion and interruption in culture, at the conquest period, the excavations show.[1]

History is found in layers in the ruins at Gezer, where has been made the most extensive examination of the archæological history of Palestine; and there is quite a distinct layer for the Israelite occupation, distinct enough to be clearly observed and charted by the excavator. This does not look like a gradual invasion.

The great engineering device to supply the city of Gezer with water during a siege was ruined at this same time and never brought into use again. But when a civilization is so disturbed that it forgets its water supply, it would seem to have received rather a severe jolt, something at least that could hardly be called a development.

Then the sacred precincts of the High Place were encroached upon at the same period of Israel's entrance into the land, according to the account in Joshua, which seems to harmonize with the Biblical account

of the crowding into the city by the Israelites without the driving out of the Canaanites; and this encroachment upon the sacred place, as well as the rapid decline of some of the horrible heathen rites of human sacrifice together with the introduction of milder and more spiritual Jewish ideas,[1] certainly do seem to point toward a rather radical change in religious ideas.

As far as the evidence goes to the present time it does seem to indicate a decided change at the time of the entrance of Israel into the land of exactly the character called for by the Biblical narrative as it stands. So, using the Biblical narrative here only for comparison, setting aside for the moment any authority of that narrative on the question at issue, it appears from archæological evidence alone that the theory of a gradual invasion is being sharply challenged, with much indication of the challenge being sustained.

That the book as it stands should be thus vindicated by the archæological evidence goes far toward vindicating the unity and trustworthiness of the book. It would seem a most remarkable coincidence, to say the least, if the critical analysis of Joshua be correct, that a document so independent of the archæological history as the "P document" is claimed to be should have been combined with other material in such fashion that the whole book thus formed would be exactly in harmony with the archæological remains to be preserved for millenniums and dug up in these latter days! That would be an instance of "prevision" in the process of evolution about equal to the largest claims ever made for predictive prophecy. Even the mention of Cyrus by Isaiah would hardly go beyond this.

III. THE POST-CHRISTIAN VIEW OF THE HERMETIC WRITINGS

Those Egyptian religious documents, the Hermetic writings, in which many have found a product of the mysticism growing out of a mingling of Christian thought with later Greek philosophy, have been thought certainly to incorporate some Christian elements, or at least to reflect strong Christian influences round about. So they have been thought to be of post-Christian date. The more specific reason for this opinion is a certain "unholy resemblance" to New Testament language found scattered throughout almost the whole body of the Hermetic Writings from the earliest to the latest.

A few extracts will make this clear:—"God alone is good";[1] "Who is the author of Re-birth? The Son of God, the one Man, by God's Will."[2] "The natural body which our sense perceives is far removed from this essential birth. The first must be dissolved, the last can never be. The first must die, the last death cannot touch. Dost thou not know thou hast been born a God, son of the One?" "The Lord and Maker of all . . . . from himself made the Second God, the visible . . . . whom he loved as his Son."[3] "Baptize thyself with this Font's baptism . . . . thou that hast faith thou canst ascend to Him who hath sent down the Font."[4]

But recent critical examination of these writings by Professor Petrie has made probable their pre-Christian origin. The distinguished archæologist reasons from internal evidence in correlation with well known history. His method may be illustrated by one extract

from the discussion of the *Kore Kosmou* or Virgin of the World.

"The Egyptian forms of the names of the gods imply earlier translation than that of the other works. What seems to stamp this period is an allusion in section forty-eight, where the central land of Egypt is described as 'free from trouble, ever it brings forth, adorns and educates, and only with such weapons wars (onmen) and wins the victory, and with consummate skill, like a good satrap bestows the fruit of its victory upon the vanquished.' It would seem impossible for the allusion to the government of a satrap to be preferred by an Egyptian, except under the Persian dominion."[1]

The Writings, thus, according to such evidence, are dated from a period about 510 B.C. down till near the middle of the first Christian century. On such grounds it is concluded that "we are now in a position to gauge what ideas were already a part of religious thought and phraseology of serious persons in the first century; and thus to understand what were the other terms and ideas in Christianity which were new to mankind." "The separation of the new ideas in the teaching of Christ and of the apostles from amid the general terms of religion at the time, is the only road to understand what Christianity meant to those who actually heard the teaching of the Way."[2] In a letter to the author, Professor Petrie sums up the whole case as it appears to him in these words:—"My position simply is that the current religious phrases and ideas of the B.C. age must be grasped in order to understand the usages of religious language in which the New Testament is written. And we can never know the real motive of

New Testament writings until we know how much is new thought and how much is current theology in terms of which the *Euangelion* is expressed."

If this opinion shall be ultimately sustained, the material furnished by these writings must have a far-reaching effect upon New Testament criticism. It can hardly be denied that the theological terms of Alexandrian Greek would be as helpful in determining the exact limits of New Testament theological terms as the pages of classic Greek have been in determining the ordinary lexical definitions. Language is everywhere the mold into which thought is poured. Here then we would be able to examine with care that mold into which New Testament theological thought was cast. Surely the preparation of a language for the New Testament revelation was no less a providential care than the preparation of a people, a land, and an age.

Last of all of these theories just now challenged by archæology may be mentioned.

IV. THE DEROGATORY VIEW OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

This, which deals with grammatical forms and idioms, differs essentially from the last, which dealt with diction. The view of New Testament Greek which for a long time held the Alexandrian dialect to be corrupt, ungrammatical, and sometimes inaccurate is now boldly and probably finally challenged by the discoveries made in rubbish heaps in Greek cities in Egypt. The unearthing of business letters and documents, private epistles, even love letters, has revealed a wealth in the New Testament dialect as refreshing as it is startling.

"Diessmann . . . . found there evidence that the isolation of the sacred Greek could be maintained no more. The idioms which had been supposed to come from over-literal translations of Hebrew or Greek originals, turned up with astonishing frequency in the rough, ill-spelt letters and petitions and accounts of Greek-speaking farmers in upper Egypt, who could not by any possibility have been brought under the influence of Hebrew thought. One after another the Hebraisms vanished, to be replaced, not by the classical parallels of the purist, but by a phraseology now for the first time traced in every day uneducated Greek speech. It became plain, and it is becoming plainer with every fresh volume of papyri, that the 'language of the Holy Ghost' was, as we might have expected, simply the language of the common people, the language in which he could make himself understood everywhere by the masses to whom his revelation came."[1]

Apparently the Alexandrian Greek was, as a dialect, corrupt only in the technical sense that it differed from classic models, but at the same time it had a widespread, varied, and cultured usage.

CHAPTER XI

Reconstructive Theories not Confirmed

In considering critical theories as affected by archæological facts, we come now to A FOURTH CLASS:—RECONSTRUCTIVE THEORIES NOT CONFIRMED.

These are those theories which propose to take Scripture at other than its face value and which, as a matter of course, challenge, and propose seriously to affect, the historicity and trustworthiness of the sacred narratives. There are a considerable number of this class of theories which are still prominently, or even generally, held among those with whom such methods of criticism are in favor. These now call for a most careful examination. But it must be kept in mind that it is not the purpose of this book to present and discuss all critical theories *in extenso*, but simply to give such presentation of theories and such discussion of the bearing of archæological evidence upon them as will make clear one point, namely, whether or not the theories under consideration are being sustained by the results of archæological research.

Not a single one of these reconstructive theories has been thus sustained. This statement of the fact must at once meet the assertion frequently and vigorously made that it is otherwise. Not to weary the reader with many references at this point, the words of Dr. Driver in a late and most important utterance of criticism may be again noted and will suffice. He says: "On all other [controverted] points the facts

of archæology, so far as they are at present known, harmonize entirely with the position generally advocated by criticis."[1]

How can such assertion be made, if the theories in question are not being sustained by the facts of archæology? It is not credible, it is hardly even thinkable, that the candor and sincerity of such a man is to be challenged. Some explanation consistent with good faith and earnestness must be found. This statement and similar statements by others sometimes mean that the particular instances of reconstructive theories which happen to be immediately in mind and under discussion at the time are not advocated by those making the statement and not by them regarded as generally advocated by critics. This, however, only explains a very few cases. In most instances this broad assertion of harmony between reconstructive theories of criticism and the facts of archæology means that the theories in question have not been positively and definitely contradicted by archæological evidence. Critical theories in such negative plight are not yet in a position to command our adherence. Are we to be asked to shape the ordinary affairs of life to all the theories of political economists which cannot as yet be definitely contradicted by facts? Are we to arrange our dietary according to unconfirmed theories of pathology and hygiene because we cannot definitely show by facts that the theories are wrong? Would men have been warranted in winding up their business affairs on the strength of the theory of some astronomers that Halley's comet was going to knock this old world off the track, because they could not definitely contradict

the theory by facts? And are we, then, in the vastly more important realm of the soul's eternal interest, to accept unconfirmed theories concerning the Word of God simply because we cannot present facts which definitely contradict them? It is not enough that theories be not definitely contradicted by archæological facts. We have already seen that they must be definitely corroborated by such facts before being accepted and allowed to affect one's life and one's hopes for eternity.[1]

In still other instances when it is asserted that the "facts of archæology so far as they are at present known harmonize entirely with the position generally advocated by the critics," those making the assertion are simply mistaken. That this is so must be shown. It is not necessary, however, to inquire in every case how they come to be mistaken. Presentation in full of a specific instance will so illustrate the sources of mistakes as to be far more satisfying. Fortunately such an instance is at hand in the latest and most important utterance of criticism on the subject of support from archæology, an instance which, in part, illustrates this very ordinary well-intentioned blundering, and, in part, the rather subtle fallacy mentioned in the last paragraph, the fallacy of claiming harmony with particular theories where there is not positive contradiction.

I. THE UNHISTORICAL CHARACTER OF GENESIS XIV

Dr. Driver says: "It is stated by Professor Sayce expressly, and by Dr. Orr, and Professor A. T. Clay, by implication, that Nöldeke's arguments against the

historical character of the narrative of Genesis xiv have been refuted by archæology. The statement supplies such an object-lesson of the methods on which the opponents of criticism not unfrequently rely, that it may be worth while to explain here the grounds upon which it rests. Here are Professor Sayce's words (*Monumental Facts*, 1904, p. 54, cf., though without Nöldeke's name, *Monuments*, p. 161 f.): 'In 1869 the great Semitic scholar, Professor Nöldeke, published a treatise on the "Unhistorical Character of Genesis xiv."[1] He declared that "criticism" had forever disproved its claim to be historical. The political situation presupposed by it was incredible and impossible; at so distant a date Babylonian armies could not have marched to Canaan, much less could Canaan have been a subject province of Babylonia. The whole story, in fact, was a fiction based upon the Assyrian conquest of Palestine in later days. The names of the princes commemorated in it were etymological inventions; eminent Semitic scholars had already explained those of Chedorlaomer and his allies from Sanskrit, and those of the Canaanitish princes were drived from the events in which they were supposed to have borne a part.' And then he goes on to declare triumphantly (p. 55) how the progress of archæology has refuted all these statements." "It will probably surprise the reader to be told that, of the series of arguments thus attributed to Professor Nöldeke, while the one about the names is attributed to him with partial correctness (though in so far as it is stated correctly, it has not been refuted by archæology), the other arguments were never used by him at all." "The one grain of truth

in Professor Sayce's long indictment is that of the names of the five Canaanite kings, which are given, Bera and Birsha (suggesting the idea of "evil" and "wickedness"), and perhaps Shin'ab and Shem'eber as well, are formed artificially but this (n.b.) is not asserted of the name of any of the four kings from the East."[1] "The fact is, Nöldeke's arguments on Genesis xiv have not been refuted, or even touched, by archæology. Professor Sayce has simply not mentioned Nöldeke's real arguments at all. Nor are they mentioned by Dr. Orr or Professor Clay." "Archæology has met the arguments which Nöldeke did not use; it has not met the arguments which he did use. Nöldeke never questioned, as Professor Sayce declares that he did, the general possibility at this time of an expedition being sent from the far East into Palestine: his argument consisted in pointing out various historical improbabilities attaching to the details of a particular expedition; and archæology can overthrow this argument only by producing evidence that this expedition, with the details as stated in Genesis xiv, actually took place and this up to the present time (June, 1909) archæology has not done."

This seems conclusive. If one knew nothing more of the case than what is here stated, and were content to accept Driver's assertion without examining the evidence himself, he must conclude, as this eminent critic evidently expected his readers to conclude, that the claim of harmony between archæological evidence and critical theories in this part of the Word of God is completely made out and the claim of his opponents utterly refuted. Those, however, who care to examine

evidence for themselves and to draw their own conclusions may compare these declarations of Driver one by one, though in somewhat different order, with Nöldeke's own words now to be quoted, and then compare Nöldeke's statements with the facts of latter-day archæological research. Some very surprising things will appear.

Nöldeke says: "The chapter begins with an imposing enumeration of kings, in whose time the narrated event is alleged to have occurred . . . . Of what use is the dating according to kings, the time of whose reigns is perfectly unknown to us? . . . . so that the dating is wholly superfluous and tells us nothing."[1] Bera and Birsha are said to be "quite decidedly unhistorical." "The alliterative pairing also of these names speaks more for their fictitious than for their historical origin. It is striking that for the single historical city of Zoar, no name of the king is given." "Besides, we are bound to no time, for the event recounted could quite as well have taken place in the year 4000 as 2000; the artificial chronology of Genesis is for us no rule." "Whence the narrator got the names of the hostile kings we cannot say. They may really have been handed down to him, perhaps quite in another connection. However that may be, the utmost we can admit is that he has employed a few correct names intermingled with false or invented ones, and the appearance of historicity thus produced can as little permanently deceive us as the proper names and dates in the book of Esther."

"Concede provisionally the correctness of the names of the kings and test the narrative further." Here in

a long paragraph Nöldeke follows the *reductio ad absurdum*, arguing that, from an historical standpoint, the provisional supposition is incredible and impossible, and concludes, "Now this whole expedition is historically improbable to the same extent that it is adapted to the production of a striking effect; the usual sign that it is fictitious . . . . Does not the manifest improbability of the narrative lie precisely in the details which give it the appearance of historicity?"[1]

Concerning the story of Abram's pursuit of the kings and the rescue of Lot, he says: "If that is possible, then is nothing impossible. It may be replied that the number of Abram's servants was in reality much greater; but everything depends upon it, and the number belongs again to the very things which spread over the narrative the deceptive shimmer of historicity."[2]

Of Melchizedek and the Amorite allies of Abram, he says: "So do the proofs pile up, that our narrative has no historical worth." "Even if the rest of the chapter were historical we would still hold Melchizedek a poetical figure."[3]

He sums up the argument in the following: "In accordance with what has been said, it is very improbable that the composer in the chief matters rested upon a real tradition of the people, but we must accept as a fact that it is a free creation throughout."[4]

On the same subject, in reply to some of his critics, he says: "I sum up once more the general points: (1) Of the names mentioned in Genesis xiv, several are unhistorical (the name of Sodom and Gomorrah, the three Amorites, Melchizedek: in my view also Abram and Lot and probably the four overwhelmed cities).

(2) The expedition of the kings can not have taken place as narrated . . . . Even through the very clearness of the narrative are we made to know that we have here to do with a romantic expedition, the course of which is determined by aim at sharper effect, and which has for itself no historical probability. (3) The small number of the host in whose complete victory over the army of the four kings the story at last comes to a climax is contrary to sense, while yet it designates about the utmost number which as his own fighting men a private citizen could put in the field. Whoever now through all of this will hold to an historical kernel may do so; he must then admit that at some perfectly uncertain time in great antiquity a king of Elam ruled over the Jordan Land and made a war-like expedition thither. But that would be the utmost concession I could make. Everything more precise, as numbers, names, etc., and also exactly that which produces the appearance of careful tradition and trustworthiness, is partly false, partly quite unreliable. . . . . more especially beyond the conquest itself nothing whatever could be known. But to me it still seems much more probable, in view of the consistent, and for the aim of the narrator exceedingly well-ordered, but still, in reality, impossible course of the narrative, out from which there cannot be separated any single things as bare exaggerations of the tradition, that we have here a conscious fiction in which only a few historical names have been used."[1]

It must be apparent to every one who has carefully followed this comparison between Nöldeke's statements and Driver's assertions concerning Nöldeke's views

that there is a serious discrepancy between them, greater, indeed, than any discrepancy which either Driver or Nöldeke thought to point out in this passage of Scripture. We cannot for a moment impugn the literary honesty of the distinguished Oxford professor, but must, it would seem, conclude that he did not know of all that Nöldeke had said on the subject and to which Professor Sayce referred. Driver's representations of Nöldeke's views are fairly well sustained by the particular passage from Nöldeke's *Untersuchungen* to which he refers, taken alone, and seem to have been based upon those statements, but Nöldeke's statements in the *Wissenschaftliche Theologie* are absolutely ignored in the representations made of Nöldeke's views by Driver. He seems not to have known of these further statements. In any case he is partly mistaken in his views and partly he has fallen into the fallacy of calling that harmony which is only lack of contradiction, the harmony that prevails in time of war when no enemy is in sight.

Nöldeke does plainly teach the very things which Driver so categorically says he did not teach: the incredibility of the political situation presupposed by the narrative in Genesis xiv, the questionable character of the story of a warlike expedition from the East to Palestine in that age, the fictitious character of the names of the principal persons in the narrative, in most cases no more than poetical fancies or etymological inventions, and the generally unhistorical character of the narrative which he characterizes as a "free creation throughout," and "a conscious fiction."

So much for the "harmonizing" of Driver with Nöldeke. Let us now consider the "harmonizing" of the results of archæological research "so far as at present known" with the positions advocated by Nöldeke. These results have been stated in different places, in the former parts of this volume, and need only be enumerated together here. A confederacy of kings in the East, of that period, with Elam in the ascendency, has appeared.[1] Chedorlaomer has not yet certainly been identified, but the first part of his name is used by Elamite kings of that time, and the second part of his name, *Lagamar*, is the name of a prominent Elamite god. There is yet dispute about the exact identification of these individual kings, but no one would now venture to say that their names were "etymological inventions," much less, that the narrative is a "free creation throughout". The improbability of an Elamite king making a warlike expedition to Palestine in that age, which Nöldeke so rhetorically insinuates, has disappeared before the knowledge of the Elamite suzerainty over Amurru at that period of history. "In a number of inscriptions, Kudur-mabug also calls himself *Adda Martu*, which means 'Prince of the land of Amurru (Palestine and Syria).' In other words, the inscriptions prior to the overthrow of Elam and Larsa record the supremacy of Elam over this region."[2]

Then Melchizedek, though still not identified on the monuments, yet in the light of the strange title "It was not my father, and it was not my mother," etc., used by the kings at Jersulaem in the days of the Tell Amarna correspondence. cannot with safety be called a "poetical figure."[3]

Not every position of Nöldeke has been positively contradicted by the results of archæological research, and that is all the basis there is for the claim that the "results of archæology, so far as at present known," harmonize entirely with the positions advocated by that distinguished critic in his consideration of this fourteenth chapter of Genesis. It is very evident that "the facts of archæology so far as at present known" are very far from harmonizing entirely with this particular opinion advanced by Nöldeke and so urgently reiterated by Driver. And the fallacy of the method used in advocating such harmony between the results of archæology and the positions held by critics also appears very clearly.

Moreover, what is true of the relation of archæological evidence to this particular theory is equally true in the case of other reconstructive theories of criticism at present held. Let us proceed to some detailed examination of them in order.

II. THE PATRIARCHS NOT PERSONS BUT PERSONIFICATIONS

This eponymic theory concerning Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and even all of the twelve heads of tribes, has had a somewhat varied career. It has been widely held, and is still widely held, by men of varying views on critical questions in general. It has been most frequently found among the advanced critics of the Graf-Wellhausen School. Yet it has been specially urged by Dr. Driver and Dr. Cheyne of Oxford. And, strange to say, Professor Sayce of Oxford also, who has for a long time been a most determined opponent

of the Graf-Wellhausen School, has recently set forth some very puzzling and rather remarkable views on this subject.[1] Professor Eduard König of Bonn, though somewhat inclined to conclusions of a reconstructive kind, yet strongly insists upon the historicity of the patriarchal narrative and even includes the story of Moses in the list of true historical writings.

On the other hand, Dr. Skinner, in his recent *Commentary on Genesis*, while rather grudgingly admitting the historic personality of Abraham, thinks the Joseph story fiction. Conservative critics usually hold rather firmly to the personality of all the patriarchs and the historicity of the patriarchal narratives. Some critics think that even archæological evidence favors the eponymic theory of the patriarchs and especially of Abraham. Professor Barton, in a paper before the American Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, gives an admirable presentation of the best and the most that can be said on that side of the subject. In addition to his words already quoted, he says: "This is the age the XVth and XVIth Egyptian dynasties to which all the Biblical references except Genesis xiv point as the age of Abraham. Genesis xiv we must still believe, placed Abraham earlier, for the age of Hammurabi must have considerably preceded the Kassite migration." This anachronism would, of course, of itself make the narrative unhistorical. He however concludes with this broad and charitable utterance, "Whatever the truth may be, it will eventually prevail. No real scholar desires to substantiate a position simply because it is old, or to embrace an opinion simply because it is new and revolutionary. He desires the

truth and the whole truth, and he welcomes any science which can help him to it."[1]

This jumble and confusion of various clashing views, now from one side and now unexpectedly from the other, well represents, as it is here intended to represent, the state of critical opinion on this important question. The one point to be made here in the consideration of them all is that archæology does not sustain the eponymic view. It is not claimed that the personality of these patriarchs has been proved by archæological results. The burden of proof in this case lies on the other side. The narratives exist. On their face, they appear to be historical. They have been so received for three millenniums and, by all the rules of evidence, those who would oppose the representations of such ancient and reputable documents must assume the burden of proof. We shall see that the burden is made a very heavy one by the facts of archæology which, while not positively proving the patriarchs to be persons, does provide much which tends to put them above suspicion on that point.

Petrie's discovery concerning the Hyksos at Tell el-Yehudiyeh[2] so provides an historical setting for the reception in Egypt of the patriarchs Abram, Joseph, and Jacob and his other sons as to avert any suspicious appearance of a mythical element in the Biblical stories of those persons.

The theory that the Joseph story is fiction has been strongly bolstered up by the claim that no such name as Zaphnath-Paaneah existed in Egypt before the ninth century B.C.[3] This principal prop is taken away by the discovery of lists of Hyksos kings and the

pointing out by Lieblein of three royal names from these lists preceding the time of Joseph compounded with the etymologically puzzling part of Joseph's Egypian name. Of the many attempts to identify Joseph's name in the Egyptian language, none other has provided more appropriate signification for Joseph's name and none has been phonetically so satisfactory.[1]

The latest, and superficially the strongest, piece of evidence urged against the personality of Abraham is the reappearance of the claim for "the field of Abram" in the inscription of Shishak II at Karnak. This is the starting point of Professor Barton in the review above referred to,[2] and is given special notice in the *Addenda* to Driver's Seventh Edition of his Genesis.[3] Driver says the name in the list of Shishak II "is considered now by Egyptologists to correspond to a Semitic *hakel Abram* 'field of Abram.'" Professor Barton has informed the author that he is now satisfied that the identification is not correct.

Even if this supposed evidence be real, it only amounts to this, that it is the first actual appearance of the name Abram in the history of Palestine outside of the Bible, and it is of late date. But the appearance of the name at this time does not prove that it was not known in Palestine before the date of the inscription in which it is contained. If such a place as "the field of Abram" actually existed at that time, what presumption does its existence create that it had not been there for a thousand years, even from the time of the first historical appearance of Abram according to the Bible account. If the existence of the name there at that time presents any presumption at all, is it not

rather in that direction? And who knows that the name did not appear elsewhere in Palestine, though we have not now, or yet, any record of it?

But the evidence for this name "the field of Abram" is of the most dubious character. It is highly to be regretted that it is so, for every one would welcome the name of Abram in the inscription of Shishak II or in any other record either earlier or later. The putting forward of this reading of one name in Shishak's list in the popular history of Egypt by Professor Breasted[1] has brought it to the front like a great discovery. It is nothing new to Egyptologists. Perhaps every one who has read this list of Shishak has been attracted toward this reading, but upon careful examination it has been in nearly every case rejected. It is really hardly within the bounds of possibility Discussion of the case in full is of too technical a character for these pages, but may be seen from both sides of the controversy, by those interested in making the examination, in the publications of Egyptologists on the subject.[2]

The evidence from archæology has not as yet proved the patriarchs to be persons and the patriarchal narratives to be history, but as far as it goes it all tends in that direction by providing suitable historical setting for the narratives, thus lifting them in nearly every case above the reach of reasonable suspicion. The eponymic view is wholly theoretical for which much can cleverly be said, but which archæological evidence, the only kind of real evidence in this case, does not sustain.[3]

III. THE RUDE AND CRUDE CIVILIZATION OF PALESTINE IN PATRIARCHAL DAYS

This theory of Palestinian civilization is not only not being positively sustained but is being positively and definitely refuted, as shown in a former part of this discussion. Nevertheless, the subject is still under discussion and the theory, one of the reconstructive theories tenaciously held by some persons at the present time. A learned and interesting discussion has recently appeared presenting very fully both sides of the question.[1] Strange to say, the evangelical and moderate Professor George Adam Smith argues for the nomadic, half-wild life of the patriarchs and incidentally for the rude and semi-barbarous condition of the land, while the radical and rationalistic Professor Eerdmans as ardently defends the more settled character of the patriarchal civilization. It is needless to pursue this subject further, for every portion of the foundation upon which George Adam Smith built has been cut away by the archæological researches of Sellin and Macalister in the brief time that has elapsed since the discussion. So that the theory may be left to die a natural death in the minds of those who hold it.

CHAPTER XII

Reconstructive Theories not Confirmed—Continued

The next theory to be considered, following a natural order, is the vague but startling theory of

IV. THE DESERT EGYPT

This daring piece of speculation is built not upon the great body of references to Egypt in the Bible, but upon a very small number of obscure passages of Scripture which contain reference to a "Mitzraim" or "Mitzrim" or "Matzor," "Musri," which are not all clearly understood at present, together with some similarly obscure passages on the monuments. It was fully put forth by Winckler in his *Forschungen*.[1] After collecting a number of obscure instances from Scripture and the monuments which seem to refer to a place called Musri in north Arabia, he says: "What we know of actual historical remembrances of the people of Israel from pre-Canaanitish time points to a sojourn in Musri. Would it now be inconceivable that the kernel of the tradition of the Egyptian sojourn was not, as these instances, a fact, and that all other additions are indebted for their origin to the confounding of the two names 'Musri' and 'Mizraim'?"

This learned Assyriologist then set up the claim for a "Musri," Egypt, in north Arabia along the Palestinian border of the Sinai peninsula. Upon so slender a foundation of facts it was proposed to reconstruct much

of the Bible history in which Egypt is mentioned. To this Egypt the patriarchs were to be sent; there was to be whatever of bondage Israel really suffered; thence the Exodus, merely a moving over the border into Canaan; and a princess from among these desert rovers was to be made the wife of the great Solomon.

This theory was never accepted by many, and by scarcely any reverent students of the Word, though Professor Cheyne[1] became strangely enamored of it and thinks that "when Mr. Macalister maintains that these Egyptian objects (at Gezer) confirm the statement of the received Hebrew text of I Kings ix, that Pharoah 'king of Egypt went up, and took Gezer, and burned it, and gave it to his daughter, Solomon's wife,' he treads upon insecure grounds. That the place referred to in Kings is Mr. Macalister's Gezer and that Solomon's father-in-law was king of Egypt, are both statements which seem to be highly disputable."

The "Desert Egypt" is not being sustained by the results of archæological research. The voluminous mass of evidence for Israel's relations with the Egypt of the Nile valley cannot be set aside by a vapory theory arising out of a few obscure passages of Oriental literature. All the work of Chabas, of Brugsch, of Naville, of Petrie, of Müller, of Bliss, and of Macalister connecting patriarchal, Israelite, and Canaanite, history with Egypt cannot be swept away by a wave of the mythologist's wand. The researches at Gezer afford special light upon this theory.[2] Gezer was a marriage portion of that princess whom Solomon married, a part of her father's dominion, and so a part of the supposed "Musri," if it ever existed; and if so, at Gezer, then, we should find some evidence of this people and their

civilization. Of such there is not a trace. But instead we find from very early times, but especially at this time, Egyptian remains in great abundance. The evidence is thus almost as strong against "Musri" as it is in favor of Egypt. For a civilization cannot exist without manifestations. There cannot be a civilization that does not appear any more than a refinement or a morality that does not appear. Civilization is in this respect like a sound. Where there is no manifestation it does not exist.

Gezer supplies the time and one of the places for "Musri" manifestations, if the "Musri" theory be true. But the "Musri" civilization has here no manifestations, and it is scarcely possible to resist the conclusion that there was no such civilization. The argument *e silentio* is valid for at least one conclusion, this, namely, that since there is silence there is *no sound.* There was not enough "Musri" civilization to make a "sound" in its own territory. While of such a place and people there is not a trace at Gezer, remains of the real and only Egypt are abundant not only in that age but from the time of the Hyksos King Khayan, eight hundred years or more before, until the Neo-Babylonian Empire frightened the Hawk of Egypt back to abide forevermore among the palm groves of the Nile.

V. THE COMPARATIVE UNIMPORTANCE OF MOSES AS A LAWGIVER

This is a theory concerning Moses more often assumed than mentioned. When written down in black and white it is rather startling—seems, indeed, to have an unholy look. Popular respect for the great-

est character in the Old Testament, in the ancient tradition of the church, and in the ancient world, causes a not unnatural modesty in those who hold such a theory, which restrains them from too frequent explicit mention of it. But the theory is widely and necessarily held by those who follow fully the usual analysis of the Pentateuch. It is necessary to many who probably have not as yet recognized its necessity, or, indeed, given it a serious thought. But necessary it is whether recognized or not. For when Deuteronomy is "found" for the first time in the days of Josiah and is attributed to Hilkiah or some other and unknown person of that time, when the code of Leviticus is given almost *in toto* to P, another great unknown, and the legislative matter in Exodus ascribed to J, E, and P, with only a grudging admission that some portion of it might be as old as the days of Moses, what is left to Moses but the Decalogue and perhaps a portion of the Book of the Covenant?[1] The critical microscopes have been turned upon the Ten Commandments. Some think they were originally in the Hebrew "ten words," possibly from Moses, and that all the remaining portions consist of additions; and Budde speaks of the "impossibility of the Mosaic origin of the Ten Commandments."[2]

When all this is done, and if it be really and rightly done, the comparative unimportance of Moses as a lawgiver must be admitted to stand as an accomplished fact. This is an assumption which underlies the "assured results" of criticism today. This is not the place to pick flaws in the critical method that produces such "assured results." The one thing to be noticed

here is that this theory concerning Moses as a law-giver is not sustained by archæological evidence. It is not, indeed, positively refuted in the way that critics so often demand that their theories be refuted. The broken tablets of the law have not been found where Moses dashed them into pieces on the slopes of the Mountain of the Law, nor has any one discovered the "book of the law of the Lord by the hand of Moses" which was found in the days of Josiah, nor has the autograph copy of the law of Moses bearing the copyright of the newly founded Israelite nation yet been secured! But the intelligent faith of the great common people will not demand any of these things nor any such things. It will rather demand that those who present critical theories of the Bible for public acceptance shall present at least a little archæological evidence positively supporting those theories. Such evidence has not been furnished for this theory. On the contrary, archæological evidence is entirely in harmony with the Mosaic authorship of the great body of Israelite legislation and there is some evidence from archæology which contributes its influence very positively toward such authorship for the Pentateuch.

Granting that God in his revelation always chooses fitting agents and a suitable age, the Precepts of Ptah Hotep show that the "wisdom of the Egyptians," long before the age of Moses, had attained to a capacity for moral maxims which indicates an intellectual and moral stage of advancement quite consistent with the revelation of God through the mind of Moses as we have it in the Decalogue and other parts of the Pentateuch. For Moses was learned in all the "wisdom of the Egyptians."

Again, the law of the Pentateuch is a code, the separate statutes being stated abstractly, as applicable to all cases. Here is not merely a collection of court decisions known among lawyers as common law. Moreover, while much has been said about the fragmentary character of the laws, and some appearance of fragmentariness may duly be made out, because of the weaving of the laws into the connected narrative of the story of the journeyings, yet a careful study of the law has shown that it is a well-systematized Code. But such a Code is not untimely in Moses' day. The Code of Hammurabi, probably the most systematic Code ever produced, coming from a time some five centuries earlier than Moses, shows that even for so long a time the age had been ready for the production of a systematic Code.

The many library marks to be found in the Pentateuch are perfectly well accordant with the conditions in the Mosaic age and no more discredit the real authorship of Moses than the more numerous library marks discredit the real authorship of Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, or of Kurtz in his *Church History*.

These various items of archæological evidence set wide open the way for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuchal legislation to which the Mosaic tradition underlying the promulgating of the law in the days of Josiah definitely points. That such a Mosaic tradition existed at that time is certain. Without it by no possibility could the people have been persuaded to receive with authority a book purporting to be by him. The question of the truthfulness of that par-

ticular claim altogether aside, there must have been such a national hero as Moses well known to the people, as well as a confident belief in an age of literature reaching back to his days, else the Book of the Law would not have been received by the people.

In the face of such a tradition, which it is much easier to believe than to believe that it arose without some reasonable justification, the effort to belittle the importance of Moses as a lawgiver in an age so well fitted for the production of laws has before it a very difficult task. It is not being sustained by archæological evidence. Indeed, the weight of archæological evidence bears against it.

We come now to the consideration of the latest and most startling of the critical theories of the present generation.

VI. THE NATURALISTIC ORIGIN OF ISRAEL'S RELIGION FROM ASTRAL MYTHS

It is important in the interest of fairness in the discussion to discriminate sharply and clearly between this theory of Israel's religion and the others in the list of theories now held which are not being sustained by the results of archæological research; because this theory is put forward by those who antagonize the Graf-Wellhausen school, and it is intended to displace that whole system of Biblical criticism.

The real founder of this new German school of criticism, the members of which are known as the Pan-Babylonists (for a very sufficient reason which will presently appear), is Professor Winckler of Berlin, and it boasts among its members the distinguished Oriental-

ists, Professors Zimmern[1] and Jeremias[2] of Leipzig and Jensen[3] of Marburg. The length to which these critics have gone in their speculation has appalled the most radical representatives of other schools of criticism and is, perhaps, more than anything else in the discussions of the day, responsible for the reaction toward more sane and safe speculation in Biblical criticism. Nothing makes adventurous persons take heed to their ways more than to see some still more venturesome one fall over a precipice. Complete presentation of the speculations of the Pan-Babylonists can only be obtained from their own works. To these the reader is referred and also to the admirable brief statements in English of these new views recently prepared by Professors Barton[4] and Clay, some extracts from which will suffice for our present purpose.

"What occurs on earth is only a copy of what occurred in heaven. Astrology, therefore, was the all-important test and interpreter of ancient history. All ancient nations, including Israel, practiced it or were influenced by it.

"The periodic changes in the positions of the heavenly bodies gave rise to certain sacred numbers. These Winckler uses to show the bearing of the Babylonian astral mythology upon things Israelitish. According to his views, not only is the Israelitish cult dependent upon Babylonian originals, but also the patriarchs and other leaders of Israel, such as Joshua, Gideon, Saul, David, and others, are solar or lunar mythological personages.

"Abraham and Lot are the same as the *Gemini*, called by the Romans Castor and Pollux. Abraham,

together with his wife, who was also his sister, are forms of *Tammuz* (who was a solar god) and *Ishtar*, the former being the brother and bridegroom of the latter. As *Ishtar* was the daughter of *Sin*, the moon-god, Abraham must be a moon-god; for he went from Ur to Haran, two places dedicated to that deity. Many circumstances of the myths concerning Abraham corroborate this. The three hundred and eighteen men who were Abraham's allies, in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, are the three hundred and eighteen days of the year when the moon is visible. All Babylonian gods were represented by numbers. Kirjath-arba, the one center of Abraham myths, means the 'city of Arba, or four.' *Arba* must then be the moon-god which has four phases. Beersheba, 'the seven wells,' another center with which Abraham myths were identified, also represents the moon, because there are seven days in each phase of the moon. Isaac, who lived at Beersheeba, must, therefore, also be a moon-deity. The four wives of Jacob show that he also is the same. His twelve sons are the twelve months. Leah's seven sons are the gods of the week. The twelve hundred pieces of silver which Benjamin received represent a multiple of the thirty days of the month; and the five changes of garments that he received are the five intercalary days of the Babylonian year."[1]

The preposterous character of some of these speculations makes them really laughable, but as the details of the theory are worked out by the followers of Winckler they become horrible and at last blasphemous. Zimmern thinks "that in Israel the writer considered

Yahweh to be identical with Marduk. Later, these same elements of the Marduk cult were applied to Christ by the Christian Jews. The story of the birth of Christ has its origin in the fabled birth of Marduk. Babylonian elements are also found in the regal office of Christ, as well as in His passion. Asshurbanipal, as a 'penitent expirator,' gave rise to the story of His weeping over Jerusalem and His agony in the garden. His death is suggested by that of Marduk and Tammuz; and the idea of His descent into Hades comes from the goddess Ishtar's descent. The resurrection is a repetition of Marduk and Tammuz myths."[1]

But the climax of the profane and the preposterous is reached by Jensen of Marburg in these words as quoted by Professor Clay: "The old Israelitish history, the history of Jesus of Nazareth, has collapsed, and the apostolic history has been exploded. Babylon has laid Babylon in ruins—a catastrophe for the Old and New Testament science, but truly not undeserved, a catastrophe for the mythology of our church and synagogue, which reaches into our present time like a beautiful ruin."[2]

Only the necessity for a clear understanding of these blasphemous speculations in order that the claim of the support of archæology for them may be exposed justifies setting them forth here, in the words of the devout and reverent scholar, Professor Clay.

This theory of the Pan-Babylonists is not sustained by the results of archæological research. There are references to myths in the Bible, but they are far less frequent than in English, French, German, and other modern literature and no more significant in the Bible

than in such literature. Would any one attempt to convict modern history and other forms of modern literature of being but myths because of references to Mars and war, to Venus and passion, to the Lares and Penates of our hearth-stones, to Thor the thunderer and to Kris Kringle and the joys and expectancies of childhood? Ancient myths personified human virtues and vices, and so, as figures of speech, passed into modern language and have no other meaning or use in modern literature. The large claims made by the Pan-Babylonists, the advocates of this theory which would turn nearly the whole Bible into myth, for the support of archæology is fairly justified thus far and thus far only. Archæological research does explain many of the Biblical references to myths by making fully known to us those myths. But for such an interpretation of those references as reads the myths into the Bible, archæology furnishes no support whatever. Such a method as reads the ancient myths into history, psalm and prophecy, even into the evangel and the epistles and the very biography and teachings of Jesus himself, would convict the literati and even the theologians of the present day of holding to the Greek mythology and worshiping Greek and Roman and Scandinavian gods. The very names of the week would convict us all of being pagans by such methods of literary criticism.

The wonderful transformations the Pan-Babylonists make with the numbers of the Bible are almost too absurd to command serious attention. They remind one of the tricks with numbers with which magicians entertain their audiences, or of the Baconian cipher with

which a few literary people have amused and puzzled the world for a long time; or, if they are to receive serious attention at all, it is only such as must be given to the efforts of the older etymologists and a few in our own day who try to trace linguistic relationships between the most distant families of human speech by means of the punning resemblances which the narrow limits of vocal powers make it possible to point out between any two languages and even between human speech and the sounds made by animals and birds. These coincidences in numbers are no more important than such punning etymologies.

VII. THE LATE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH

It is important to remind ourselves that the one question to which we are to seek an answer concerning the late authorship of the Pentateuch, is whether or not this theory is being sustained by the evidence furnished by research in Biblical archæology. The many other lines of argument by which this theory may be tested will be noticed no farther than as they may be incidental to this archæological inquiry.

Formerly this theory of the late authorship of the Pentateuch rested upon three pillars: the ignorance of the patriarchal age, out of which it was said that such a literature could not have come; the marks of a later age upon the Pentateuch, upon its diction, its laws, its history; and last and chiefest, the literary analysis of the Pentateuch, breaking it up into fragments, J, E, P, D, R, and, by some, into a much larger number of divisions, the criteria for some of which excludes everything bearing any peculiar impress of an earlier

age. As a matter of course, in accordance with this criterion of assignment, these particular fragments appear to be of a late date and by their incorporation into the body of the Pentateuch necessarily demand a late date for that whole portion of the Bible.

The first of these pillars upon which this theory rests, the ignorance of the patriarchal age, has altogether collapsed. The discovery of the Tell Amarna tablets and the Code of Hammurabi, the excavations at Tell el-Hesy, Taanach, and Gezer, together with the overwhelming and still growing evidence of the general culture and refinement of that age, have made it desirable and convenient for a great many to forget, and to wish others to forget, that such a conception of the patriarchal age was ever any part of the support of the theory of the late date for the authorship of the Pentateuch. It is not pleasant to seem ungracious toward one's opponents, but the complete presentation of the subject here demands that attention be called once more to the fact that this that was once a support for the theory of the late date for the authorship of the Pentateuch has collapsed and that the corner supported by it now hangs in the air.[1]

For the second of the pillars upon which this theory has rested for support, the marks of a later age upon the diction, laws, and history of the Pentateuch, archæological data can be cited with some good degree of plausibility, but it cannot fairly be said to be sustained. There are marks of a later age in the laws, in the history, and sometimes in the diction, but they admit of a very easy and natural explanation. It is not at all surprising to find some laws in the Pentateuch that seem to have

arisen out of conditions in much later times and many laws that certainly look forward to the occupation of the promised land. For it is not unreasonable that some laws should have been added to meet the new conditions of the Kingdom when it was established—not having been originally contemplated in the institutions of Israel—or have been introduced in connection with the more elaborate ceremonial appropriate to the temple. And that there should be in the Pentateuch many laws applicable only after the occupation of the land of Canaan is exactly what is to be expected according to the view that the Pentateuch was composed during the wilderness sojourn; for both at the first giving of laws and again at the composition of Deuteronomy, according to that view, Israel was expected to enter immediately into possession of the promised land.

That some items of history have been added at a later time is admitted by all of every school of criticism; just as many works of great men have been published in later times with copious notes and additions, far more copious, indeed, than any one has ever claimed in the Bible. Here, for example, in my library is one copy of Herodotus in a single duodecimo volume and another in four octavo volumes, because of the historical notes added by the editor. Such notes are now clearly distinguished from the original text. But had this large edition of the ancient historian been issued a century after his death, with the literary form and according to the literary methods of that age, there would have been a pretty problem here also for the literary critics. But especially is it true of autobi-

ographies that additional items of information are appended, on account of the death of the author. It is certain that this has been done in the Pentateuch, on the theory that it is in any sense the work of Moses; and, when the difference between the literary methods of the ancients and of ourselves is taken into consideration, it no more militates against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch than against the authorship of many modern autobiographies. It was literary license in epitaphs of that day in Egypt that the dead one should be allowed to speak in the first person even on his tombstone.

That the diction of the Pentateuch should seem to have some marks of a later age is not at all remarkable, nor is it inconsistent with the early authorship of the book. The process of eliminating obsolete words from sacred books has been going on under the very eyes of the English-speaking people during the last century. Why should it be thought a literary impossibility in the millennium before Christ? Tenaciously as the religious spirit clings to the old forms, common sense will at last prevail over the toleration of bad sense in the literary forms of expression in religion. Then, words thought to be evidence of late date are sometimes very misleading. They may indicate nothing more than the fact that every author's vocabulary is limited. No one ever uses all the words of his time. The words that seem late in the Pentateuch may have been in use in the days of the early prophets and historians, but not used by them. And again, what seems a new word may be but the recrudescence of an old word. Prince Henry of Germany was twitted about using

American slang while visiting in the United States because he said on one occasion that he must "hustle," but retorted with the information that "hustle" is a good old English word. It has such authority for its use as Scott, Thackeray, and Froude. It had been for a time forgotten but had come to the surface of the English language in a new land and a later age. Then, in addition to these considerations already mentioned, the small number of words which can be produced from the Pentateuch which seem to be late Hebrew, and the absolute lack of any other Hebrew books of the early period for the authorship of the Pentateuch with which to make comparison, weakens the force of the objection to the early authorship on account of diction until it is altogether negligible.

On the other hand, there are marks of early authorship in the diction of the books of the Pentateuch to which none of these explanations are applicable and which do not seem to admit of any other explanation than that of early authorship itself. The examination of a few of these words will indicate how very far archæological evidence is from supporting the theory of the late authorship of the Pentateuch.

A somewhat hazy, precarious clause in a bargain with the Towarah Bedouin for the convoy of a party to Sinai had been that they would give the travelers a glimpse of the turquoise mines.[1] So they peered under great rocks and into crevices where real gems could be found, and enjoyed in sober-mindedness the thrill of expectation which the romance of childhood with its dreams of gold mines had awakened. But the greatest marvel of that day was to find the gems

not in crevices or peeping out of dust and rubbish, or like nuts in a shell rolling about with the appearance of worthless pebbles, but embedded in the very heart of the solid rock, where blind but patient industry discovered them by breaking them out of the bed in which they have lain from the foundation of the world.

Now if one of these dusky miners should exhibit a large, rare gem of marked peculiarities of shape, with the claim that it had come from that mine, and we should find the empty matrix in a rock into which every nicety of the gem fitted exactly, or if we found a strange hole in the rock and the miner should produce a gem which exactly fitted it and say: "I found it there," we would not be able to resist the conclusion that the miner's story was true.

Let us carry this simile over into the examination of archæological evidence on this question of the early or late date of the composition of the Pentateuch. A host of treasure seekers in Egypt—Chabas, Brugsch, Naville, Lieblein, indeed every Egyptologist—in searching expectantly about the ruins of Egypt have found now and then an empty matrix, and some Old Testament writer has furnished a literary gem, whose every peculiarity fitted exactly into it. When we see how exactly, we cannot escape the conclusion that here also the miner's story is true. There are certain books of the Bible which purport to have had Egyptian sources or associations and there are certain literary correspondences which substantiate the claim, certain gems of language of marked peculiarity for which the exactly fitting matrix has been found in Egypt. Thus these correspondences become witnesses; witnesses

which cannot lie, for their points of peculiarity are too many, and can not be suborned, for their testimony is incidental and lies outside the domain of human intention. These witnessses testify to two closely related material points in the great controversy over the Pentateuch: first, the truth of the patriarchal story, and, second, the time of the Pentateuchal record. There is a long list of Hebrew words of marked characteristics found in the Egyptian language of such meaning and use and at such a time as to indicate the presence and great influence of Semitic people in Egypt, an influence which could only have been exerted by large numbers present in Egypt for a long time. There is striking indication, also, of the slavery of those Semitic people. All this, showing, as it does, the exact historical truthfulness of the patriarchal stories, creates a presumption of the early writing down of these stories. In the citing of words we will here confine ourselves to those linguistic evidences which bear directly upon the question of the date of the composition of the Pentateuch.

We take up now this Pentateuchal question to determine whether the indictment against Moses be a true bill; or whether it be possible to vindicate his authority, or at least to render innocuous the insinuations and charges made against it. The witnesses to be introduced are Egyptian words in the Hebrew Bible, accrediting the authorship of the records to the same age as the events recorded, and hence the date of the Pentateuchal documents to a time not long subsequent to the patriarchal events. Incidentally some corroborative evidence also will appear.

In Bible lands names were and still are significant. Among the first questions the Egyptians ask concerning a new missionary from America is, "What does his name mean?" Alas for the missionary whose name, either by translation or transliteration into Arabic, happens to convey a disagreeable meaning to the Egyptian mind. Names in that part of the world today are usually religious in their significance. In ancient Egypt they were almost always so, and from that fact arises great help to the student of the history of that ancient people. It comes about in this way. The Egyptians had "gods many and lords many." Fond parents named their little one after the god most honored in the neighborhood at the time, or because of the auspicious event of the birth. But one god was in greatest favor at one time, and another god at another time, and besides, the ascendency of certain gods was localized in certain parts of Egypt at various periods of Egyptian history. It thus comes about that papa and mamma in naming the baby in old Egypt were constructing a kind of chronological index to Egyptian history (indeed, one of the best we possess), at the same time often giving a good clue to the part of Egypt in which they resided. Thus the gods of Egypt did for Egyptian history on a far larger scale what the national heroes have done for America. "George Washingtons" did not become numerous until after 1776, nor "Abraham Lincolns" until after 1861. Thus it happens that Joseph's Egyptian name, Zaphnath-paaneah, and the name of Joseph's Egyptian wife, Asenath, have become important witnesses in the Pentateuchal question. Strange to say they have been

summoned to testify by both sides of the controversy. Some years ago M. Kraal argued from the then known data that names of the meaning of these names were unknown among the Egyptians until about the IXth century B.C. which would bring the story down to the time of Ahab and would shut Moses completely out of the case. Now this is exactly the conclusion reached by those who hold to the critical analysis of the Pentateuch, and they have persistently quoted this opinion of Kraal, and of Egyptologists who have quoted Kraal, from that day to this, as may be seen in the great Bible Dictionaries of the last quarter of a century, and in the works of popular writers on the modern criticism of the Pentateuch, such as Professor George Adam Smith[1] and Dr. Driver.[2] It is a very convenient way, when you wish to find something and find just what you need, not to find anything more. That is exactly what these men have done in the consideration of this subject, having found this that suited their theory, and which was perhaps as much as was known at the time Kraal wrote, they have ignored every discovery on the subject since made. One might search almost in vain for any reference in their writings to the work of Lieblein in his study of Egyptian names, who has pointed out among the names of Hyksos kings, who lived and ruled in Egypt about the time of Apophis, the traditional Pharoah of Joseph, three names of kings formed with the significant and troublesome part of Joseph's name. Nor would any one ever learn from critical discussion of this subject that Lieblein's identification of Joseph's name in the Egyptian is better etymologically and far more exact phonetically than

any other identification of the name which has been suggested.[1] Asenath also has been identified as a name in use from the eleventh dynasty (long before the time of Joseph) until the XVIIIth dynasty near the time when arose the "king which knew not Joseph."

Thus these two names instead of being fatal to the early authorship of the story of Joseph are in harmony with it, and actually accredit the authorship of that narrative to an age not much later than that of Moses. For, are we to be asked to believe that some scribe of the days of Hezekiah or of the exile, or even post-exilic times, was an Egyptologist who dug up the ruined and forgotten archives of the Hyksos period, which the later generations, in hatred of those foreign rulers, had done everything in their power to destroy and eradicate, and so carefully selected names which would support his desire to have the people receive this story as a genuine one from the hand of their great national hero, Moses? Or must we prepare our credulity to accept the alternative, that some happy chance directed his genius in selecting or inventing names for his heroes and heroines which only a Lieblein of the end of the XIXth century A.D. should discover to be just what the highest art could have produced? Surely no one will ask us to believe that Providence took a special hand in this plan to impose a new book on an unsuspecting people under the name of a very early author.

The only credible explanation of these special linguistic harmonies is that the documents in which they are found come from an age before the traces of the Hyksos kings disappeared into oblivion, which cannot

be later than the Mosaic age—and the age of the Israelites, who alone were interested in keeping alive in Egypt the memory of those days.

Another word from the same region and the same period gives testimony to the same effect, the Egyptian word "Aat." We have heard much in these latter days about the "yellow peril." The imagination of many statesmen, or at least alarmists who wish to be considered statesmen, see it hovering upon the political horizon of both Europe and America. Old Egypt in the days of Joseph and the Hyksos kings had also a "yellow peril" which became a reality, and which, long after it passed away, was still a "yellow peril" to the fears of the Egyptians. They called it "aat," which means "abomination" or "pest." They applied this hateful name to the Hyksos tyranny and to all associated with those foreign kings. Indeed, so spiteful was the national hatred against these people, and so persistently did they call them by epithets, that it has never been possible to learn from the Egyptians the ethnic name of their oppressors. To this day the race and nationality of the Hyksos is involved in something of mystery. So Joseph said to his brethren, "Every shepherd is abomination to the Egyptians." Now the Egyptian word "aat" does not appear in Genesis. Being not a proper name, but a mere epithet, the author of Genesis did not transliterate it, but translated it into the Hebrew by the very exact equivalent "*toabah*," *i.e.*, "abomination." The Hyksos were driven from Egypt by Amasis; then the great kings of the XVIIIth dynasty, the Thothmes and Amenhoteps, established firmly the eastern frontier of Egypt,

and extended the empire from the "river of Egypt" to the Euphrates. "Aat," "abomination," that ogre of the eastern horizon, disappeared from the Egyptian imagination, from Egyptian history, and, in this use of the word, disappeared from the Egyptian language. Egyptian pride scorned to make mention of the time of great humiliation, and after a little time reference was seldom or never made to it. And yet we are asked to believe that some time "before the time of Jeremiah," after the lapse of some eight hundred years, or even in the time of the exile, after a thousand years, some Jewish scribe doing the desire of a designing priesthood, to foist upon the people a new book in the name of Moses, attained to such a philological nicety as the special use of this Egyptian word "aat," and used it correctly long after this special use of it had ceased to be current in Egypt. Rather we will prefer to accept the alternative that here is distinctively the mark of authorship contemporaneous with the "yellow peril," for at least within the memory and dread of it in Egypt.

Hawthorne in his *English Note-Books* gives account of many of the episodes of a consul's career in Liverpool in the fifties. Among other things, he relates how Englishmen tried to palm themselves off as Americans in order to obtain some favor of the American consul, perhaps assistance to get to America as stranded American citizens, and that he was always able to detect them, much to their amazement. The one place where every one betrayed himself was in the use of the word "been," which Americans pronounced like "bin" and the English invariably like "bean." The truth is that

art can never perfectly take the place of experience in the use of words. The historical imagination may be possessed and cultivated to such a degree of perfection that one may faithfully reproduce the atmosphere and the color, but in colloquial use of words no amount of study can ever take the place of actual experience. The possibilities of variation in the use of words is so infinite that sooner or later art will always stumble and fall. Where there is no stumbling we may know of a certainty that it is not art but experience.

Some words now to be introduced as witnesses are to testify to this effect, that, in the choice of words of local use and coloring, the writers of the Pentateuchal documents manifest a proficiency, a dexterity indeed, that plainly shows that we are not in the presence of the consummate art of the historical novelist, or the pious romancer, or the interested forger, but in the presence of experience only supplied by actual residence or extended intercourse. The Peruvians have a word for dry, upland pasture, "pampas," which has found such acceptance with the Latin-Americans that its use has spread over much of the arid region of South America, and has made its entrance even into other nations of people having intercourse with that part of the world as the most fitting name for this particular pasture-land, and for no other. Egypt also has peculiar pasture-lands, those among the luxuriant grasses of the swamp lands along the Nile and the canals. The ancient Egyptians had, likewise, a distinctive word for that kind of pasture land, the word "akhu." The Hebrews in their dry and hilly country have had many

expressions for the grass of the field, and used especially five words—"desheh," "hatsir," "yerek," "eseb," and "asab." These words they used throughout the Old Testament. They had no need at home for such a distinctive word as the Egyptians employed, for they had no such pasture-lands. And even when they were carried into captivity and sat "by the rivers of Babylon," if they had found need for such a word in their language, it would have been the Babylonian and not the Egyptian word which they would have taken up into the language. Yet in Pharaoh's dream, recorded in the Pentateuch (a story that is born in Egypt, and grows up in Egypt, and never quite loses sight of Egypt), the "meadow" in which the kine fed is called by the Egyptian word "akhu"; and in the book of Job, where are other marks of Egyptian association, when it is said: "Can the flag grow up without water?" the same Egyptian word is used, and nowhere else in the whole Bible is this word found. Was this probably art, or was it more probably experience?

Linen was largely devoted to a sacred use in Egypt. The mummy-cloth has been found upon the most critical examination to be every thread linen. Priests of ancient Egypt were clad also in linen. For this "fine white linen" the Egyptians had also a distinctive word, "shesh." What figures more conspicuously in the description of the Hebrew ritual than the "fine white linen" of the Levitical priesthood, which description belongs we are told to a much later period? The Hebrew language had its own words for linen, four in number,—"bad," "pishteh," "sadin," and "aitun," which are used throughout the Old Testament. In

one instance,[1] in a book having no Egyptian sources or associations, even when the linen of Egypt is mentioned, it is called by a pure Semitic word, "aitun." But in the Pentateuch the Egyptian word "shesh" is used thirty-four times, as the distinctive Egyptian word for the "fine white linen" of the priests, linen which they had brought with them from Egypt.

Bayou is a provincial word in America, belonging exclusively to the region of the lower Mississippi. In Louisiana, its home, it means simply "channel for water." And "the bayou" means the particular channel at hand. The ancient Egyptians had also a word of very similar meaning and belonging as much to the Nile valley as bayou to the lower Mississippi. This word was "yeor," a channel for water, applied indiscriminately to the river and to the numerous canals and channels by which the water was conducted through the land. It was not in any sense a proper name for the Nile, which the Egyptians called "Hapi," but a common noun, like "bayou," which, upon becoming definite, meant, like "the bayou," simply "the particular channel at hand." Its use as thus described is very common in both Egyptian and Coptic, or later Egyptian. In exactly this same sense it was taken over into the Hebrew of the Old Testament and especially the Pentateuch. The word occurs in sixty-six passages in the Old Testament. In but one of these passages, Daniel xii, 5–7, where the word occurs four times, is there any doubt about its reference to Egypt. The passage in Daniel is in dispute. Some believe it to be a prophetic passage referring to Egypt, but it is usually accounted to be historical and not of

Egypt. But in any case it follows upon an extended prophecy relating to Egypt, if, indeed, it is not a part of that prophecy, and the use of the word here might easily be accounted for by the coloring of the context. Aside from this passage, in all the other sixty-five passages in the Old Testament where the word occurs, in some of which, several times, it is of the streams of Egypt. The Biblical writers no more think of using "yeor" of streams elsewhere than in Egypt, than would American writers tell of "bayous" in New England. This is of special significance in the Pentateuch. For it is to the Pentateuch that the use of this word is almost entirely confined. Its use elsewhere is confined to occasional passages, as in the prophecies relating to Egypt. The occasional use of this word in other parts of the Bible, or its use even in the Pentateuch, if it were used but seldom there, would not signify much, and might be allowed to pass unnoticed. But its extended use in the Pentateuch with such absolute accuracy cannot be credibly accounted for except as the result of experience. But the full significance of its use there does not appear until we observe a further peculiarity of that use. The Hebrew has two words for river,—"nahar" and "nakhal"—which are used exclusively in all those parts of the Bible not purporting to speak of Egypt or have relations with Egypt. "Yeor" is there very completely supplanted by these words. In the Pentateuch these words are of very frequent occurrence also, but not of the streams of Egypt. Each of them occurs thirteen times in the books of the Pentateuch, but not in a single instance of the streams of Egypt. When the writer refers to

Egypt, he drops into the use of the word "yeor," just as naturally as an American writer into the use of "bayou" when referring to the lower Mississippi region. So strictly is this distinction in the use of words observed that when mention is made of the little desert stream called the "river of Egypt," which was not an Egyptian stream at all, but marked the borderland, it is not called "yeor," but given the Hebrew name, "Nakhal." Such absolutely discriminating use of the colloquial meaning of words with such perfect accuracy throughout such an extensive literature seems incredible of any writer not to the language born. And when the various portions of the Pentateuch are attributed to several different writers in different lands and far distant ages the phenomena present a literary impossibility.

Now these three words which have been examined all testify to the one point, perfect accuracy in the peculiar colloquial use of common words, not proper names, to which art can never attain, and for which only actual association can account. The author of the Pentateuch must have been familiar by actual colloquial use with the Egyptian tongue. Hawthorne's test in the colloquial use of words, not proper names, would catch a scribe of the times of Hezekiah, or Josiah, or the exile, just as certainly as it caught tricky men at Liverpool a half-century ago. That any one should have imitated the colloquial, provincial peculiarities so perfectly at so great a distance, in days of so little intercourse or correspondence, is incredible, not to say inconceivable. "Romancers," "historical novelists," "pious allegorists," "forgers," as you please, must have

been skillful beyond the imagination of the heart of man to conceive, to have attended to such a little thing over so wide a field of literature without a single mistake.

Thus it appears that there are some marks of late authorship in the Pentateuch which, however, all admit of easy and natural explanation, but on the other hand there are marks of early authorship which admit of no explanation except that afforded by early authorship itself. This does not prove that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, but it does point to the Mosaic age as the time of its composition, and especially it makes absolutely certain that the theory of the late authorship of the Pentateuch is not being supported by archæology at this point of its literary marks of the time of authorship.

The third pillar of support for the theory of the late date of the authorship of the Pentateuch, the literary analysis of the books, is in reality the theory itself in the concrete; for having decided upon criteria of the analysis in harmony with the theory of the late date and then having parcelled out the materials to the various documents according to the criteria, it is found that the theory is supported by the results. Of course! As when a crippled man puts down his own crutch to support himself upon it, he *finds that it reaches to the ground.* It was made exactly the right length to do so.

The parceling out of the materials of the books of the Pentateuch according to the criteria propounded by the theory of the analysis into documents mostly of a late date does make a literary analysis of the

Pentateuch in wonderful harmony with the theory, just as in every other feat of legerdemain we may get out of a box whatever is put into it. If the criteria were supplied independent of the theory and not to serve it, the results of their application might rightly command our attention. But as they are in part assumed and are altogether a part of the theory these wonderful results of the critical analysis are not archæological evidence nor, indeed, any other kind of evidence, though superficially they seem to be testimony contemporaneous with the composition of the books themselves. They are the implements, indeed, of the theory, whereby the materials are manipulated; they are no more than fingers of the prestidigitator. A theory that works in history and in literature is not by that fact proved to be true. The theory of the late date for the authorship of the Pentateuch, however beautifully it may work out as a theory when applied to the materials of the books, is not established until corroborated by independent facts such as only archæology can supply. To this present time it has not supplied such facts. On the contrary, as we have seen, there are many evidences, of which we have examined a few, which point very emphatically toward authorship for the books of the Pentateuch not later than the Mosaic age. The publication of these evidences has filled two whole volumes and so cannot be condensed into a single chapter here. The reader who wishes to pursue this subject at length is referred to those volumes.[1]

VIII. THE INCOMPLETENESS OF THE BOOK OF JOB

The theories considered in this chapter and the preceding one do not exhaust the list of reconstructive theories but include the principal ones, and are sufficient to illustrate the fact that such theories are not being sustained by archæological research. There are many things in the results of archæological investigation which are neutral, do not positively corroborate any particular view of Scripture; and many results also which have no bearing whatever upon Biblical questions. But where there is such bearing it is never of such a character as positively to sustain these reconstructive theories. Indeed, however much is said about the "harmonizing" of archæological finds with "the positions generally held by critics" or "being favorable to them," no one can point to a single definite particular of archæological evidence by which any one of these reconstructive theories has been positively corroborated and sustained.

CHAPTER XIII

Fallacies: Sources of Differing Conclusions Among Honest and Sincere Seekers After Truth

We have considered each of these reconstructive theories, presented in the two immediately preceding chapters, singly and in detail. There remains on the whole subject a FIFTH AND MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION relating to all these theories alike. It may well be asked, How can it be that sincere and honest men of great scholarship have indorsed Biblical theories of a reconstructive character, if they be so doubtful when tested by the results of archæological research? The answer is simple enough: *they do not see them in that light.* But why do they not see them in that light, if that be the light? Such difference of opinion among sincere men of high attainments can exist only through the subtle influence of fallacies, which have been allowed unawares to creep somewhere into the processes of thought. It becomes any one to speak modestly when he alleges fallacy in the mental processes of another. He who criticizes another's logic does by his criticism put his own logic on trial, and the multitude in the great amphitheater of public opinion decide between the contestants in the arena by thumbs up or thumbs down. To this tribunal we must submit the case. The fact is that these reconstructive theories are not being supported by archæological evidence, though held by men of the highest attainments in scholarship.

In explanation of this state of things, a few of the fallacies will here be pointed out through which some of the best scholarship of the world has, as it seems to many, fallen into error in Biblical criticism.

I. THE FALLACY INTRODUCED BY REASON OF PRESUPPOSITIONS

What one sees from any given standpoint depends in part upon the direction in which he looks. Two persons looking in opposite directions from the same standpoint will often have before them very different landscapes. Presuppositions determine the direction in which a man looks, and the theories which he forms will accord with things as he sees them. A man's theories must fit in with his presuppositions; he has no disposition to theorize in any other way. So it is the presuppositions of the reconstructive criticism which limit its vision and which require the reconstruction.[1] A theory of reconstruction follows, then, as a necessity and in accord with the presuppositions. It cannot be said that the reconstruction came first and independently. The existence of documents, *i.e.*, the existence of library marks in the Pentateuch, was as far as Astruc went towards reconstruction. He still held to the Mosaic authorship. Other men with far different presuppositions, the presuppositions so manifest in the current form of the Higher Criticism of today, took these literary marks suggested by Astruc and worked out a reconstruction not necessitated by the literary marks, but in accord with their own presuppositions. But the presuppositions of the reconstructive criticism are not the presuppositions of the book itself; immediate

creation, the supernatural in religion, the fall of the race, objective revelation and regeneration. The books of the Pentateuch were constructed in accord with these presuppositions. The question of the essential truthfulness or falsity of the presuppositions in either case does not enter into the question here. The point is that the character of the book must, by the laws of the mind, correspond to its presuppositions. But the presuppositions of the reconstructive criticism are diametrically opposed to those of the book: instead of immediate creation, mediate creation; instead of the supernatural in religion, God working wholly through the natural; instead of the fall of the race, the rise of the race; instead of any objective revelation, a wholly subjective revelation; instead of regeneration, evolution. Their theory, then corresponding, as it must, to their presuppositions, cannot be the theory upon which the book was really constructed. A most familiar illustration of this is to be seen in the radically differing sources of the Civil War in America suggested from the same data, because presented respectively by Northern and Southern men with their radically differing presuppositions. It will not do to say that this argument applies only to the work of the final redactor who put the materials together and left the books as we now have them. For that is to beg the question by assuming the correctness of the analysis which produced the fragmentary materials and so required the help of a redactor, but the correctness of the analysis is the heart of the whole question at issue.

So the reconstruction rests upon the presuppositions of the critics. These, being radically different from

those of the book, yield necessarily a very different result. Men with such presuppositions arrive, logically, honestly, sincerely, at such conclusions.

II. THE FALLACY OF DEDUCTION WITHOUT COMPARISON OR FROM INSUFFICIENT INDUCTION

The distribution of materials in the analysis of the Pentateuch, especially, and in some measure of other parts of the Bible, begins and in large part proceeds, by means of lists of words thought to be peculiar to certain assumed authors, or to certain ages of Hebrew literature. Next to the fallacy of presuppositions, this might be called a fundamental fallacy of the current Higher Criticism of the Old Testament. The fallacy lies in this, that there is no comparison, without which deduction is utterly worthless; or, at best, the induction is so insufficient as to make the comparison practically worthless.

Hebrew literature of ancient times consists of one book and a few brief inscriptions of very limited vocabulary. Or, considering the separate books of the Old Testament as so many books, as must be done in criticism, there is, then, but one book or one document or one small group of documents of very limited extent from any given age or author. That certain words are not found in any one of these documents or groups of documents proves nothing as to the age of the words or of the documents. No one author, in two or three pages or in a hundred pages, uses all the words of a language which are current in his time, or even all the words of his own vocabulary. The subject, the circumstances, the purpose, the state of the author's feel-

ings and the tone adopted for the occasion, and many other things, some of which can never be known to anybody but himself, influence an author's choice of words. If there were an extensive literature by the same author or of the same age, any words under consideration which do not appear in this might appear in that. To say that one book or one portion of a book is earlier or later than another, because a certain word appears or does not appear in it, when there is absolutely not another scrap of Hebrew literature of that age or by that author with which to compare it, is an exhibition of logical method which might pass among the pupils of a primary school, but is unworthy of a school of Biblical criticism. This fallacy of deduction after defective comparison or no comparison at all, introduced into the premises, vitiates the whole process of reasoning which follows, though it be conducted according to the most rigid logic and in the utmost candor and sincerity. Scholarship and piety even avail nothing anywhere along the line, if this fallacy has been introduced at the beginning, so that no one may rightly question the sincerity and the earnestness of purpose of one whom this slip in formal logic has led into the wrong path.

III. THE FALLACY OF SEEKING FOR DISCORD

Criticism is not faultfinding, but it very easily becomes so. And when it sets out on a course of reconstruction which questions the integrity and trustworthiness of the documents to which it is applied, the disposition to find fault, to look for discord, is irresistible; indeed, it is essential to the process. But it is a fallacious method which is very apt to nullify processes of thought.

It is as though a man takes one road at the forks and, though finding it rough and hard and unpromising, yet follows it persistently to where it falls over the precipice, insists that that is the end of all things, and jumps over; whereas the one thing wrong is that, instead of searching all roads, he took the wrong road at the forks and followed it to the end. No one can question the sincerity of the despair that prompted him to leap to his death. But had he searched all roads before finally choosing one, he might have traveled in comfort and peace and safety to a happy destination.

Again, no jury in court would be willing to convict a man of lying or of perjury because there is a way in which he may be made to appear to be guilty without inquiring most carefully whether his words and his acts admit of any explanation consistent with his veracity.

But the analytical criticism sets out upon its divisive and destructive and reconstructive course, finding, as is natural enough when things are pulled to pieces, confusion growing worse confounded as it proceeds, yet keeping on and asking others to follow upon this road to the precipice. Is it surprising that cautious persons pause and try some other road before the final leap? It is sometimes said that conservatism in Biblical study is narrow. Yet it is especially in conservative schools today that *all roads are searched, all views examined.* Perhaps it is because it is so that they are conservative. We do not question the scholarship and candor and sincerity of purpose of those who devote themselves so exclusively to one line of progress open to criticism, but it would be an exceedingly interesting experiment for them to make trial of equal candor and

sincerity in examining all roads. Those who seek discord are certain to find it. Only those who seek also for harmony can be sure whether or not harmony exists.

IV. EXCLUDING OR IGNORING PART OF THE EVIDENCE

Another fallacious method is the dangerous practice of excluding or ignoring part of the evidence. The ancient Orient left great treasures of art and literature most of which have been lost, alas, perhaps forever. Some of that literature, however, has never been lost, the most important of which are certain writings of the Hebrew people, especially the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa. We call these SCRIPTURE. They are none the less *literary remains of antiquity*.

Some remains of antiquity were recovered a long time ago, especially at the time of the revival of letters. Notable among these remains, in addition to the great mass of poetry, tragedy, and essays, are the remains of certain travelers, geographers, and historians, as Herodotus, Strabo, Syncellus, and Eusebius. This whole class of literature we call CLASSICS, but they also are *literary remains of antiquity*.

Then, many things are being now discovered, tablets, bricks, inscribed columns, temples and tombs, and many merely material objects not bearing any inscription which yet also, as well as the inscriptions, throw much light upon the civilization of ancient times, its art, its learning and its religion. These things we call ARCHÆOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES. They also are, in large part, *literary remains of antiquity*.

Thus all these alike, whether SCRIPTURE or CLASSICS or ARCHÆOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES, are *remains of antiquity*, and as archæological material are of equal rank and value according to their character. But by very many critics they are not so treated. On the contrary they propose to apprehend one of these, the Scripture, thrust it into the prisoner's box, deny it the inalienable right of a prisoner before conviction to be heard in his own defense without undue prejudice, summon all the others as witnesses against it in an attempt to convict it of untrustworthiness; and if any inscription of a boastful old heathen king can be found to say a word against the statements of the Bible, loudly proclaim that the Scriptures have been discredited. This method of procedure neglects testimony, and reaches a conclusion upon but a part of the evidence. Such a method is unfair, and, in the name of logic and the Anglo-Saxon spirit of fair-play, must be protested against. The Bible itself is archæological evidence, the best and the most voluminous on the subjects it touches and equally entitled to a hearing with all the other kinds of archæological evidence on those subjects; and is not to be thus so easily outlawed and condemned on the authority of any or all of the other kinds of evidence.

A recent volume by the Manchester University[1] contains a learned, comprehensive, and really very helpful review of Assyriological evidence on the period of Israel's middle and later history by Professor Hope Hogg, since deceased, which may be cited as a typical example of this fallacy of neglecting a part of the evidence. It is used as an illustration at this point not because it is unusual, but because it is so usual and,

not being controversial, has not the excuse of self-defense, and being announced as "Recent Assyriology: its bearing on our Views of the History of Israel," might be expected to supplement each source of evidence from the other. If an archæological inscription from some Canaanite or Assyrian source had been in hand of an extent equal to that of the historical books of the Bible which cover this part of Israel's history under review and which recorded the private life and daily habits of men during that period, it is safe to say that there would have been scores or even hundreds of references to such a document. Yet here are these historical books full of archæological material, such as is needed to fit in with the Assyriological evidence adduced and to confirm its aptness by filling up its gaps, evidence differing *as archæological material* in no respect whatever from such supposed document except that it *has never been lost*, yet in this long review of twelve thousand words there is scarce one reference to the archæological material of that age furnished by these historical books of the Old Testament. They are, seemingly as a matter of course, put on trial and remanded to silence until the verdict shall be rendered. Yet Professor Hogg was a sincere, candid, and courteous scholar. He was only taking for granted one of the false conceptions, and following unquestioningly one of the fallacious methods of the times.

V. UNSCIENTIFIC SPECULATION

Perhaps the most specious, and hence the most dangerous, of all the fallacies by which men deceive themselves and others in the critical controversies of the present day is the fallacy of unscientific speculation.

Scientific speculation has done much for Biblical research. It is that exercise of the religious soul in an attitude of faith to which was made the promise of the Spirit who should lead "into all truth." The whole sum-total of modern learning is the result and outcome of scientific speculation. But unscientific speculation is the plague of research work. It is the black death of the learned world. If the scholar contracts it, his case is usually hopeless. Its ravages are acknowledged and deplored on all hands, by all research workers and in every department of investigation.

It becomes every one to be modest about giving specific illustrations of this fallacy from the field of controversy, especially critical controversy. But it does seem perfectly safe to point out some things. When critics ignore the only statements made anywhere in the world concerning the exodus and the wanderings of Israel and proceed to construct a totally different history, involving a different length of time, different circumstances, a different number of people, different religious habits, and a different outcome, for all of which assumed facts there is no source at all, but a subjective one, it is not rash to say that, if the speculator has any anchor at all, he is dragging it hopelessly. When the early Palestinian history of the tribes, recorded in simple, unvarnished narrative, without the slightest literary indication of allegory, parable, personification, or legend, is transformed by critical speculation into a complete series of shadow pictures cast upon the curtain of antiquity by the highly wrought religious fervor and imagination of much later times, in which is concealed for us in

reality a totally different history of tribal development in southern Palestine and Arabia in which names, places, and events are absolutely changed, where even the Davidic history becomes unrecognizable, and, indeed, no clue remains anywhere to the original intent of the Biblical writers, but the critic is obliged to bring the whole new presentation of the narrative out of the domain of subjectivity—when, I say, speculation soars aloft and afield like this, surely such speculation is unscientific. To speak plainly, such speculators have no "historical sense." They put mere fancy in its place.

VI. THE BUGABOOS OF INTERPRETATION

There is a pair of fallacies—a pair because much associated together, though independent in action—which may only be characterized by that plebeian word bugaboos, scarecrows, things of unreal fearsomeness. These are the fallacies concerning tradition and evolution. These two words, not in themselves or because of anything deceitful in their reality, but because of fallacious use of them, are ofttimes so dressed up for service as to become veritable scarecrows in the eyes of the ignorant and innocent; and sometimes by those ignorant and innocent are conjured into veritable hobgoblins that turn the day of faith for many into the horrible gloom of nightmare.

1. *Tradition.* The epithet tradition, or traditional, is forever flung into the face of those who still hold what has been held throughout the ages among the scholars of Christendom. So used it is intended to brand with superstition and mere credulousness those

to whom it is applied. And it has been too often accepted in much the same sense by those to whom applied. They have rather gloried in the notion that they believed what has always been believed, as though its acceptability rested upon that instead of upon inherent truthfulness.

But tradition in this opprobrious sense is only a bugaboo set up by one class of controversialists to frighten their opponents, and often accepted by their opponents as though a reality. The absurdity of this is manifest, when we consider the real meaning and use of tradition. Its current use rests upon the supposition that traditionalists accept mere gossip that floats around; while their opponents proudly boast their reliance only upon what is written. Now the truth is that all historical information is tradition before it is written down. Usually it passes from lip to lip sometime before it is committed to writing. Even where the historian is an actor in the history, the account is first in his mind and formulated there before it is recorded in any way. Thus there is not a scrap of history that was not first tradition. It may not even be said that such immediacy of the historical record insures its correctness; for most historical events are seen more correctly in perspective. Nor can it be said that tradition is peculiarly liable to gather accretions; but rather that writing tends to enlargement of an idea, as every writer knows, and in addition fixes the enlargement for permanency. The old dictum that what has been believed by all, from the beginning, and is not inherently improbable, is to be accepted, whether it be written or spoken, is in accord with sound common sense.

2. *Evolution.* The word evolution is just now the most troublesome word in all the discussions of the bearing of science upon religion. It is with some a scarecrow over which they chuckle to see the fearsomeness it has for some of their opponents. To others it is a veritable hobgoblin that may well, to their excited imagination, be a real demon. While there is a radical difference in belief between those who hold the theory of evolution and those who reject it, yet a very large part of the discussion that is raging today arises out of the fact that the word evolution is being used in two very different senses and that without discrimination.

Evolution in its proper primitive and scientific sense means an unrolling from within without the application of any force from without. Thus evolution as applied to this world is an *accounting for things* by an unfolding from within without the application of any power from without, creative or otherwise. It "orders God off the premises."

But the word evolution is used by many with a very different significance. I was once examining a young man for entrance into the gospel ministry. He had been accused of holding views inconsistent with the idea of a creator. So I said to him, "Do you believe in evolution as accounting for things, or as a name for the order of things." "Oh," said he, "As a name for the order of things, absolutely. I think the Creator intervened at every step forward." He was not much of an "evolutionist." He made every step of the evolving an act of a Creator. Such a view of evolution has been called "theistic evolution"

and there are a very great many devout believers in the Word of God and in the creation of this world by a transcendant personal Creator who are calling themselves theistic evolutionists without a suspicion that they are using a term to which they give a very definite meaning, but which is in reality self-contradictory. Evolution admits of no power applied from without; theistic evolution brings in a Creator at every turn of the evolving. Like many another inconsistent thing in human speech this term may ultimately hold its place as a new name of the progressive creation that is taught in the first chapter of Genesis, but it is just now a source of endless turmoil and misunderstanding. Because of this confusion, materialistic evolutionists are able to assert with a brave show of appearance of truth, if not of real candor, that "every scientist," and "all scholars" are evolutionists. I protest against being classified in a way that lines me up with those who do not believe in a Creator at all. Let us not speak of "theistic evolution," but of "progressive creation."

The fallacious use of these two terms, tradition, and evolution, thus introduces much confusion into present day controversy and often vitiates the results of research.

Thus have been presented a few of the principal fallacies, the seductive snares of which serve to explain some of the otherwise unaccountable differences among scholars today. In such ways earnest, honest, and sincere men are holding and teaching views which call upon us to place faith and hope for eternity in them, which yet are entirely out of harmony with the Bible

story itself, and are not being sustained by the material evidence brought to light from the actual life of the time of revelation. Certainly there are few, if any of them who, like the biologist Haeckel, have been charged with making their own materials for illustration, photographing the creation of their own hands for the sustaining of their theories and the deluding of their followers. The great and ultimate hope which shines through all the clash and confusion of controversy is this all but universal sincerity of purpose and effort to find the truth. Sooner or later it will be found by all. The needle may be disturbed by many things, but at last it will come back to the true course. However much fallacies may influence thinking for a long time, logic, which is but the academic name for common sense, is certain to prevail in the end. The spirit will lead "into all truth," and all shall ultimately see it whether they will or not.[1]

CHAPTER XIV

Canons of Research

Archæology is, in the first instance, and pre-eminently, an inductive science; it gathers evidence and summons witnesses. At the outset in the career of the archæologist a rubbish heap is simply searched and sorted. Even the inscriptions found are, in fact, written depositions of witnesses once alive, but now dead. The marshalling of the varied evidence found by the archæologist to bear upon certain points is an entering upon the domain of interpretation. Archæological evidence becomes thus an implement in Biblical archæology. Thus the use of archæological evidence in Biblical studies is necessarily a combination of archæology and interpretation, both criticism and exegesis. It is a particular application of archæological material for the better understanding of the Bible.

Here, as always in the examining and application of evidence, the human mind imposes upon itself certain canons, rules of procedure. With the formulation and conscious application of these canons in the course of the study of archæology it becomes, in the last instance, a deductive science. After long experience on the part of the excavator, the rubbish heap is not simply searched and sorted, but each particular, when found, is assigned at once to the well-known class to which it belongs according to rules which have been formulated and classes which have been made. These

classes thus become premises in syllogistic reasoning for new conclusions. Inductive logic is much lauded as the scientific method; and properly so when properly used with sufficient induction, for it draws its conclusions immediately from facts. On the other hand, deductive logic is sometimes now discredited as *a priori* reasoning and thus somewhat speculative; and justly enough so, if *it be* really *a priori*. But when, as in archæology the premises of deductive logic are thus proved facts, classes formed in sorting out the evidence, then the conclusion, though mediate and not immediate, is not for that reason indecisive, but rather the more decisive, as the conclusion is drawn not from one set of facts, but from two or more. Thus this use of deductive logic in Biblical archæology is perfectly legitimate and scientific.

In this book, *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments*, an Introduction to Biblical Archæology, we have followed in the main along the lines of nature in the illustrations selected. The evidence has been gathered and has been marshalled at strategic points in Biblical Criticism. Inevitably our minds, from their very constitution, have been imposing upon us certain canons which we have followed obediently, and, perhaps, for the most part, unconsciously. Now at the close of this part of the book, we are to formulate these canons that they may enter consciously into our future searches in the testing of the trustworthiness of the Scripture record. To this end the principal canons are now to be stated in their natural order and each with brief elucidation and illustration.

CANON I. ON COMMON SENSE

The fundamental rule of research in Biblical archæology, as in every other kind of research, is the law of common sense. Without common sense the case of every man and every investigation is hopeless. Whatever angels and seraphim might do we know not, but human beings, constituted as they are, can make no progress in the acquisition of knowledge of any subject without common sense. John Brown of Haddington greeted his incoming classes with this: "Young gentlement: Ye hae need o' three things, learning and piety and common sense. If ye hae na learning, I will help ye tae it; if ye hae na grace, God will gae it tae ye; but if ye hae na common sense, man canna and God will na do any thing for ye."

Common sense is but the sense common to all sensible people, the common name for human intellectuality, the natural intelligence according to the constitution of the soul. It comprises the elements of our thinking contributed by our intuitions, our instincts and our physical senses. Common sense may be said to be the expression of the continuity of human nature, the common qualities of thought and action which persist in all ages, among all people, and in every stage of culture.

The importance of the law of common sense can hardly be over-estimated. It contributes the only possibility of knowing things. To ignore common sense, that is to disregard our intuitions, our instincts, and the testimony of our senses, is to deny ourselves and to become practical agnostics in the most absolute sense. Such practical agnosticism is illustrated by

many varieties, though all are of one species, simply the abandonment of common sense. Such is idealism as opposed to realism, which denies the reality of things to which our senses testify, and thus refuses the testimony of the senses; and abandons the world of common sense for a speculative existence in which we have no experience and for which our physical senses totally unfit us. Common sense taken into such an idealistic world is an "Alice in Wonderland," a soul lost in the mazes of the fourth dimension of thinking. Present-day Christian Science is a more plebeian variety of this idealism, which is practical agnosticism, and nothing more nor less than an abandonment of common sense and disobedience of our instincts and our intuitions. When one hits his thumb with a hammer and declares that it does not hurt, he is denying the testimony of his senses. He is even denying his own consciousness; for it is only when he is conscious of pain that he is moved to declare that he has no pain; it is the hit thumb hurting that leads him to say that it does not hurt. Common sense is not in this case obliterated, it is voluntarily abandoned. Thus this is not wholly an intellectual lapse, it is moral obliquity, moral insanity, a disobeying or denying of the validity of the moral intuitions. Something of the same abandonment of common sense has been noticed in all ages in fantastic interpretations of Scripture, from the distinguished Origen and Swedenborg and Ritschl to the multitude of lesser personages who have given loose rein to fancy, forsaking common sense to accept as a rule of interpretation that any attractive thought that pleases them is the truth for them.

The law of common sense is indeed indorsed to us by Scripture: we are told to "prove all things," put all things to the test of our own faculties. While this includes the exercise of judgment and conscience which vary greatly in different persons, it goes back also to the same fundamental things of the soul, the intuitions, the instincts, and the senses. The senses perceive the evidence which affords proof of things; the intuitions underlie all ratiocination: and the instincts lead us along the line of processes.

The Law of Common sense may be stated thus: We are to believe only that which we intellectually see to be true.

We are not to allow any one, believer or unbeliever, to talk mysteriously to us as having esoteric views of truth which only experts may perceive, and which we must receive solely upon their authority. There are no exclusive, esoteric, views of truth. Common sense is common to all sensible people, and evidence is that which makes things *evident*. If the evidence which any one has to present to us does not make things evident, then it is not evidence at all. Thus whatever is not according to common sense, does not make things evident, is not any other kind of sense; we are not to believe it on any ground whatever.

This is not to say that there are not to be accepted any incomprehensible truths; common sense requires only that we shall see things to be true, not that we are to understand them. That which cannot be comprehended may yet be apprehended.

Nature contains a thousand incomprehensible things which yet we see to be true. There is the classical

illustration of the pasture over which ranged cattle and sheep and geese, all cropping the grass. It turned to hair on the ox, to wool on the sheep, and to feathers on the goose. All see this to be true, but does any one understand it? "Oh," says some knowing one, "that is explained by the nature of the creatures." Just so; the problem is pushed back one stage farther from us. Let some one rise to explain the difference in the *nature* of the creatures that causes this difference, and how it causes it. He may not stop with the chemistry of digestion, but must go on to the alchemy of selection and distribution, and finally to the utterly incomprehensible choice that appropriates the nutriment from the grass to make hair and feathers and wool. No one approaches to an understanding of this. We believe it because we see it to be true. A child believes all things and understands nothing. As we grow older, we believe a few things because we understand them, and the remainder because we see them to be true. Intuition, the instincts and the senses tell us of them and there the matter ends. Physicists know many of nature's operations, but when the Australian throws his boomerang explanations fall flat. There are tricks of levitation, as the lifting of a heavy person on the finger-tips, which many persons can perform, but which for the most part utterly defy explanation. Mathematicians have demonstrated that a curved ball cannot be thrown, but pitchers can hit a man *standing behind a board*, or around a corner. The most wonderful of all the practical things of life, as modern civilization lives it, is electricity . . . so-called. We have given it a name, but we do not know what it is.

The earth and the air and the widest reaches of the heavens, the stupendous works of the universe, and the infinitesimal microcosm of the atom, are all filled with a thousand things that we see to be true, *though we understand not one of them.*

If now this world of nature contains so many things which we only see to be true, but do not understand, it is to be expected that a revelation of things not of this world at all, or of that nature of which we are a part, will also contain some incomprehensible things. If it is not found to be so, it could hardly be called a revelation. But these incomprehensible things will always satisfy common sense, else we cannot receive them, *whether we will or not.* We cannot believe unless satisfied with the evidence, and we cannot withhold belief when once satisfied, even though we willfully refuse consent. In this sense, "seeing is believing"; what we see to be true we believe whatever be our disposition toward it. Now if it be a real revelation there will be evidence enough to make us believe, make us intellectually see the revelation to be true. The amount of evidence required varies with different persons and at different ages in the same person. The child believes on the testimony of those he trusts; as he grows older he wishes to know the evidence upon which it was told. But always when he sees things to be true he believes them, and not till then. Christ always gave sufficient evidence for his miracles, though those who saw might not understand a single one of them. He satisfied doubting Thomas, saying "reach hither thy finger", "reach hither thy hand." The Bible never asks us to believe anything that it does not give us sufficient evidence

to convince us that it is true. Christian faith is not "swallowing things whole," "hook, bait, and sinker"; it is belief upon evidence. Preachers are sent to be "witnesses," to give evidence. Thus the sum of their preaching is not to be exhortation, and condemnation, or constant reiteration of, "Come to Jesus." Christ said, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." The exhibition of what Christ did for men is the drawing power that wins men. They believe when they see something to believe, and preachers perform their mission, when they make men "see Jesus." It is thus the truth that convinces, the evidence that makes men believe. The fiasco of modern evangelism is that it has forsaken witnessing and given itself to exhortation.

In the application of the law of common sense we must distinguish very carefully between questions of truth and fact and questions of experience. We learn truth and facts on evidence; experience can only be known by experience. Even, "He learned obedience by the things that He suffered." The infinite wisdom knew obedience as a part of his rule in the universe; but the experience of obedience He learned only by experience. So also, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be from God or whether I speak of myself."

This application of the law of common sense has special importance in the study of Biblical archaeology, because spiritual experience very often has to do with the consideration of questions raised by archaeology. One of the strongest answers made to the claim of Baconian authorship of the plays of Shakespeare is

that the plays were certainly written by a practical theater manager. A mere philosopher might produce all the wisdom of the plays, but his wisdom could not be staged. *The plays can be staged;* such experience there manifest can be known only by experience. What is true of histrionic experience is true also, and equally, of experience of Christian faith. The Director of the American School of Archæology at Rome once remarked to me that it was of the utmost importance that Christian archæology at Rome should be in the hands of men of Christian experience; otherwise much of the significance of Christian things found would entirely escape observation.

All this is also in accord with the law of common sense. For soul experience cannot be contributed by evidence, must in fact be its own witness. This is in obedience to the intellectual intuition that a faculty of the soul can only be performed by itself. Thus the law of common sense is fundamental everywhere in our investigations. We are to trust our senses, follow our instincts, and obey our intuitions. All investigation lies within the domain ruled over by these elements of common sense.

CANON II. ON THE HARMONY OF TRUTH

This canon starts from God. There are two theories concerning the being of God. One theory is that God is a transcendental person, and that he made the universe; this is creationism. The other theory is that God is the universe, or that the universe is God. This theory may be either idealistic pantheism or materialistic pantheism, and it usually spells god with

a small letter. But each one of these theories concerning the being of God, whether creationism or pantheism, assures and assumes the harmony of truth; God will be consistent with himself so that truths will be adjusted to each other. Strange to say most people overlook this fact and so fail to realize the harmony of truth. Theism, the mind of God unifying and harmonizing all things, proposes the only possibility of truth being harmonious, and also absolutely assures it.

This Canon may be stated thus: Truth is always and everywhere harmonious.

We are to be supremely concerned about seeing the truth and having others see it, and not about understanding it and being able to explain all its intricacies. Understanding the truth and being able to show how it fits into other known truth is not of supreme importance: it always does fit; truth is harmonious. People need to see the truth; understanding it is, in comparative rank, a secondary matter, however desirable it may be. It would be pleasing, indeed, and gratifying to our vanity, if we were able to understand all the mysteries of biology, and of chemistry, and of physics, but it is only vitally important that we see the truth on these subjects whether we understand them all or not, or see how they consist with one another.

Indeed, consistency need not trouble us so much. Realities are consistent whether we see the consistency or not. We only need to know that each of the truths under consideration is really true; consistency will take care of itself. It has been said that "the folly of young men is to be consistent." The effort to be

consistent perpetuates all our mistakes; the effort to be true eliminates them one by one. This reveals to us the real significance of the expression "seekers after truth." Many persons think they are seeking after the truth, when they are only seeking confirmation of what they *already think they know.*

Thus the harmony of truth is a ground of confidence also; for if we know the truth, we may be sure of it, and be sure also that nothing else that is true will be out of harmony with it, whether we ourselves see the harmony or not. If conflict appear between truths, it is the result either of defective vision in the beholder, or of some imperfection in the medium through which one looks. Through blue glass, everything looks blue.

This confidence in the truth leads us to present one truth at a time, and with all our might. We are not to be too careful to hedge a truth about lest it get on the toes of some other truth. Such efforts are apt to result in rounding off all the corners of the truth and making it smooth and flat, especially flat. The harmony of truth will find a place for every corner of truth that projects.

Moreover it appears also from the harmony of the truth that the so called "harmonizing of truth" is a dangerous, as well as unnecessary exercise. Truth does not need harmonizing; we need enlightening. The "harmonizing of truth" is apt to be but a paring down of truth to harmonize with our ignorance. We would better seek to *harmonize with the truth.*

CANON III. ON THE SECURITY OF TRUTH

Closely connected with the harmony of truth is the security of truth: it is only the discordant things of life that are really dangerous. Harmony is everywhere safety and security.

Statement of the law: The truth cannot be disturbed by events or persons; hence facts are no menace to the truth.

Facts may seem very antagonistic, and may really be very antagonistic to the truth; but they do not prevent its being true. "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." Many actions of men are in opposition to the truth, but they do not effect it in the least. They do effect at times very much the reception of truth by men, but the truth itself remains the same and untouched. Truth is impregnable, imperishable and incorruptible. It is like chemical elements, which, whatever process they may be put through, may always be made to emerge again undiminished, unchanged and indestructible. So "truth, crushed to earth, will rise again."

The consciousness of this security of truth is one of the blessed possessions of those who really have the truth, and one of the greatest incentives to faithfulness to a false cause among those who believe themselves to have the truth, though they have it not. The security of truth is thus one of the great conservative influences of life and thought and action.

CANON IV. ON THE COMPATIBILITY OF FACTS WITH EACH OTHER

Facts may present a most antagonistic aspect; they may frown upon each other threateningly and terrify-

ingly, but they never shove each other off the universe. There is room for all of them, however antagonistic they may be to each other. Discrepancies do not necessarily imply contradiction or inconsistency, or indeed anything wrong whatever, but only that things as we know them do not exactly fit. Discrepant events, that seem antagonistic, may be only like different segments of a circle that face each other. They do not fit together at all, because something is dropped out between them, but they are parts of the same curve. Again, discordant facts may be like discordant sounds. Two tones may not "sound together," are discordant in fact; but add another tone, a third, or a fifth, or a seventh, and at once there is beautiful harmony. The discordant tones were so only because something was wanting between them or round about them.

Statement of the law: Whatever is is possible and compatible.

Some find what is to them irreconcilable discrepancies in Biblical dates, or in the dates of ancient world history, where there is no confusion whatever in the chronology, but only in their information concerning it. There was ample room for all things that happened. People are often too ready to conclude that there is something wrong with the ancient records rather than to suspect their own information, and methods, and results. The successive editions of works on chronology of the Bible remind one of the little English maiden who complained that her teacher was "*very narrow.*" "Why Betty, what is the matter with your teacher?" "Oh, *she thinks* that there can be

only one answer to a sum. Now I can get a different answer every time I do it." The time of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt and the period of the Judges in Palestine present such discrepancies. Events there do not exactly fit together in our present state of knowledge concerning them. But it does not follow that there was anything wrong with the events, or is anything wrong with the narrative of those events, but only that we do not know so many things *that are not told* us which supplied the missing segments of the circle.

Again, Biblical history and the facts of other oriental history are absolutely compatible. When our knowledge is complete, they will be seen to be so. There may be discrepancies in a narrative of events either inspired or uninspired. Different parts of the narrative may not fit together, because something is omitted. But the events fitted exactly.

The important thing in any case in a question of facts, is to assure ourselves of the actuality of events. Discrepancies in the narrative will all disappear, when all the facts are known.

CANON V. ON THE CONTINUITY OF NATURE.

Statement of the law: Nature is the same in all ages.

Nature is the order of things, the organs and interrelations and laws of activity; and the continuity of nature is simply the fixity of this order of things. This continuity is not the peculiar heritage or possession of any class of thinkers; it belongs to all the world. We live and act every moment of our conscious existence in a settled confidence that things will go on in

nature just the same, and that all its laws will continue to operate. We put water over the fire in the expectation that it will boil, not freeze; and we are not disappointed. We teach the little feet to walk and the young minds to calculate in confidence that the laws of gravitation will continue, and mathematical axioms will hold, for the rising generation. Every moment of our conscious existence is in absolute dependence upon the continuity of nature.

Also the continuity of nature belongs to time: thus its field of operations lies between the two eternities past and future, from between which time, as a little section of duration, has been taken. Before time began at creation, this continuity of nature did not exist; and it will cease at the end of time and the passing away of this physical universe.

So the laws of nature do not apply to creation, and creation cannot be explained according to the continuity of nature. Creation brought the laws of nature into existence, and began the continuity; thus these did not rule at creation. It has been well said that science can never analyze and explain creation. Science is knowledge organized according to the laws of nature, and rests absolutely upon the continuity of nature. Creation brought the laws of nature into being; they could not preside over their own birth. Creation was a miracle, the direct act of the will of God. Whatever we may know about it must be by revelation. The laws of nature cannot explain it, and there was no historian there to report it.

So also anything else not in accord with the continuity of nature is a miracle, a direct act of the will of

God, the operation of a free will. A book lies on my desk; I put forth my will to reach forth my hand and lift the book. It does not come up of itself. The laws of nature of themselves will not bring it up. There is the outgoing of a free will that does this thing. It is not in accord with the continuity of nature. It is the free act of a free will and, not being brought about by the laws of nature, is in fact of the nature of a miracle. But when it is the act of a human will, we do not call it a miracle. But when the will of God went forth to the axe in the bottom of the stream, in the days of the prophet, and caused it to come to the surface, because it was an act of the will of God, we call it a miracle. These two acts of free will are essentially of the same character. Neither is in accord with the continuity of nature. Neither the one nor the other interferes with, or suspends, or abrogates, or contradicts, or sets aside, or in any way affects, the laws of nature. Certainly, when my will causes the book to come up from the desk, I do not interfere in any way with the laws of nature; they continue just the same. And when God's will caused the axe to come up from the bottom of the water, neither did he interfere in any way with the laws of nature. They went on in their operation the same as ever. If some one, in jubilation at the recovery of the axe had tossed it up into the air, it would have come down on his head just the same! The law of gravitation was not interfered with. The miracle was just *God doing something himself*.

Such is every miracle. He who made the laws of nature may certainly do some other things also. By

fixing the continuity of nature, he has not enjoined himself from any and every other independent action. He may still come into this world and *do things himself*, things for which the continuity makes no provision. When the first edition of this book was about to issue from the press, the printer asked me if I would like to be present and receive the first copy. I went to the publishing house. The President took me to the publishing room and said to the foreman: "This is the author of that book we are issuing today. Will you give him the first copy that is bound?" "Y-e-s," said the foreman hesitatingly; "but we are not binding by machinery to day. We are binding by hand, and we finish a stack of about fifty books at once." "Oh well, in that case" said the President, "do not interfere with the rules of the shop. But won't you take a set of sheets and bind them complete yourself and give that, the first book, to the *author*?" The foreman did it; he went into the shop and *did something himself* without interfering with the rules or operation of the shop. And cannot the great Foreman of this universe come into his workshop and do something himself without interfering with the rules or operation of the shop? Such is every miracle; and this is all a miracle is. The continuity of nature, so long as nature continues, is inviolable; miracles do not set it aside, nor interfere with it in any way. Neither are those who believe in mircles debarred from believing in the continuity of nature.

Now this continuity of nature is a fundamental fact upon which all research in Biblical archæology proceeds. Nature animate and inanimate is the same in

all ages. Philosophy may change, progress or decline may take place; but nature continues. The manners and customs of people vary according to the climate and the materials available; but, under similar circumstances, men in all ages manifest the same instincts, obey the same intuitions, and observe through the same physical senses, and all in accordance with the laws of nature which make up the continuity of nature. So the archæologist is able to interpret the conduct of men even of strange manners and customs.

Some most interesting corollaries also result from the continuity of nature. Because of it "ancient" and "modern" come to be rather indefinite and relative terms. As an old man is not one who lived a long time ago, but one who has lived a long time; so, as Ferrero, the great Italian historian, has remarked, that nation, that civilization, or that history is not old that existed a long time ago; but only, if it has existed for a long time. China is a far older nation than any of the "ancient" nations, except it be Egypt. England is older than Assyria, and even America is older than the Maccabean kingdom!

Then, because of this same continuity of nature, primitive man does not represent a distinct period of history, as popular opinion so often has it, except when we mean absolutely the first man that lived. Rather, by primitive man is meant a stage of advancement in civilization, a stage that may be found at almost any time, in any place, somewhere among any people, in the history of the world. Primitive man may indeed exist side by side with the most advanced stages of civilization. The stone age, the flint age, the copper

age, and the iron age all existed together in the pioneer days in America. Thus the various "ages" of man indicate nothing whatever concerning time in human history; that must be determined by other independent evidence. There are people at present in this world who are accustomed to think of themselves as quite civilized who are yet far more "primitive" than many of those whom they are accustomed to call "ancient."

CANON VI. ON THE IMPORTANCE OF EXAMINING EVIDENCE

We have seen that research in Biblical archæology consists primarily in examining evidence; it is an inductive science. Logic knows no "law of evolution," no prestidigitator's trick of getting more out of a box than is put in it. Thus the importance of examining evidence cannot be overestimated. Because of the great value of some conclusions and the incalculable worth of the subjects upon which they bear, there is a tendency in research to give little attention to the evidence, especially if that happen to be in itself trivial and unattractive. But the more important the truth or fact established by evidence, the more important it is to examine the evidence with the utmost care, however unimportant or uninteresting it may be in itself.

Statement of the law: The value of the evidence is the only value of the conclusion drawn from it: all else found in the conclusion is not value at all.

So we are to require to see the evidence for every important conclusion drawn, and not to deceive ourselves by resting satisfied because the conclusion is

eloquently and forcibly drawn and confirms our established views. If the evidence does not sustain the case, the conclusion, however attractive, is worthless. Require to see the evidence.

We are also to examine for ourselves all the proof-texts and every reference quoted by disputants in Biblical discussions. The neglect of this is a besetting sin of all students. Eternal vigilance here is the price of accuracy. I was one day at work in the library of one of the greatest research workers in the world, when he came in to verify a reference, remarking, as he did so that he never accepted anybody's reference without verifying it, as he had found himself quoted for things he never said anywhere in the world. Even where "All the evidence," or "every instance" is claimed in support of a position, find out how much "All the evidence" and "every instance" may be. All the evidence is not enough, *if there be not enough of it.* There are some most notable—better to say lamentable—instances in which "all the evidence" and every "passage" was found to consist of but a single instance, and that *the one under consideration!*

CANON VII. ON THE RELIABILITY OF CONCLUSIONS

Statement of the law: Upon the scrutiny of the evidence depends the perception of its value, and hence also the reliability of the conclusions drawn from it.

It is not only necessary to know the evidence, but also to look it very sharply in the face, scrutinize it, that we may be sure that the conclusions are drawn wholly from it, and not from unmentioned evidence or from concepts in our own mind.

The interpretation of archæological materials is one of the most difficult phases of Biblical criticism, whether historical, literary, architectural, ethnological, or philological; and it is all of these. The fragmentary character of the materials makes a satisfactory induction difficult. The fragments are ofttimes so imperfect that it is difficult to tell to what class they belong, and thus gather the evidence together properly. Then scientific classification is ofttimes well nigh impossible. Perhaps there is but a single piece of evidence to be put into each class. Sometimes one instance may be proof, and sometimes not. One track proves the existence of the animal that made it, but "one swallow does not make a summer." Then there is the well nigh irresistible temptation to reconstruct a well-articulated civilization or semi-barbarism, as the case may be, out of the merest fragments. The ancient history of Egypt, for example, is known to us only by scraps and fragments to be pieced together. There are very many of them now, it is true, but they are still fragments. It is as though some future South Sea islander should sit down to review the ruins of New York. There would be an innumerable number of carved blocks and decorated walls, heaps of broken bricks bearing the makers stamp, capitals of many Corinthian columns, keystones of Gothic arches, fragments of several Carnegie Libraries, innumerable pieces of pottery, Dolton, Limoges, Wedgewood, Heinz's 57, many inscriptions from public buildings, and heaps of literary rubbish from great libraries. Out of such scraps the observer must reconstruct the history of New York! The desire of every historian is to make his history

readable; the historian of Egypt is not immune from that temptation. But the very readableness of such a history is usually the worst thing that can be said against it. Our knowledge of the facts is not so complete and connected as to warrant such readableness. So the romanticists, as Ebers and Ingraham, have pictured for us, in too large a measure, a work of imagination. It will pass in fiction, but not in Biblical archæology or other research work.

Then there is also the temptation to draw great conclusions from very small and insufficient premises, and so present to us a great pyramidal structure standing on its apex!

When, now, we essay to go one step further and show the correlation between archæological material and historical records, between the finds and the Bible, the difficulty is immeasureably increased. Rightly to bring together those things that are related and to keep apart those things that are only similar, though unrelated, is the most difficult task of the critic and interpreter. It is not enough that the Code of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi are similar; Codes that deal with the frailties of the same human nature have great similarities the world over, in all ages. It is necessary to show that these Codes had historical relation with one another, or else draw no conclusions concerning their relation to each other. It is not enough that the philosophy of the book of Ecclesiastes resembles Greek philosophy; it also resembles German philosophy, and the Concord philosophy! There is about as much evidence of historical relation with the one as with the other, and no more! "The ancients

thought our thoughts," and we also think theirs independently.

So it is of the utmost importance that we scrutinize with the most exacting vigilance all the evidence to discern exactly how much it proves.

CANON VIII. ON THE CATEGORIES OF INTERPRETATION

Statement of the law: Archæological evidence for Biblical interpretation may be:

1. Explicit, of the same persons, things, or events. This explicit evidence is usually thought to be most important, as it is always the most interesting. But it is well to remember that there is such a thing as mistaken identification. Individual pieces of evidence may be such mistaken identification; so in reality, this category of archæological evidence is lowest in reliability.

2. Archæological evidence in Biblical interpretation may be implicit, of like manners, customs, and times. This class of evidence is often under-estimated, and said to be of little worth in Biblical interpretation; yet, being beyond the reach of collusion, and presenting many examples for scrutiny, is in fact far more reliable than explicit evidence.

3. Archæological evidence in Biblical interpretation may be harmonious, according as it touches the Biblical record at a great many and variety of points, with or without incongruity. That this class of evidence is most valuable will at once appear, if one make up an historical narrative of an unknown community and then go to that community to see how it will fit, to what extent it will be confirmed by the events and

persons there! Only, if genuine, can an historical narrative be found in harmony with persons and events. The general and complete harmony of the Biblical record with the finds of archæology is the most conclusive evidence of the trustworthiness of these ancient documents.

This law may be summarized thus: Archæological evidence in the Biblical field may be of the *same things*, of *like things*, or *in harmony with things*.

CANON IX. ON SPECULATION AS AN IMPLEMENT OF RESEARCH

Statement of the law: No theory in Biblical research is to be accepted and made a part of faith and life until tested and attested by facts.

The underlying principle of this canon has been fully developed and illustrated in the preceding pages of this book (Chap. IV) but must be summarized here to make complete this list of canons.

Speculation is the faculty of wonder in exercise. The child says "I wonder," and following the impulse of his curiosity, he grows and learns. This faculty of wonder is the chief spring of action for both intellectual development and the acquisition of knowledge. In like manner, for a like purpose and with like propriety, the scientist may say "I wonder." Thus speculation is a legitimate scientific method.

But the speculation itself must be legitimate and scientific. Legitimate speculation starts from known facts, proceeds in the direction indicated by them, and never goes beyond the bounds of possible compatibility with them. Discovery may in its final leading tran-

scend all bounds, but speculation should keep within the horizon.

Speculation is intellectual ballooning. Scientific speculation is like ballooning with an anchor. The aeronaut from a selected place rises far above it, gets a wider view, makes observations from a new altitude, and is able to alight in safety and at will at the point from which he started. Unscientific speculation is like one ballooning without an anchor. This aeronaut may start from the same safe place as the other, enjoys at first the same enlarging of horizon, but is subject to every wind that blows, is carried whither he wills not and often knows not, cannot return at will and it may be not at all, and may alight in safety, but often ends his career in disaster.

An hypothesis which works is not by that fact proved to be correct, but may be wrong in every particular. Even if it unlock mysteries, it must still be corroborated by independent evidence. The key that unlocks the door may after all be a false key. Astronomers proceeded to the acquisition of much astronomical knowledge through the application of the Ptolemaic theory of the universe, though the theory itself was wrong (for abundant illustration see Chapter IV).

Hence no theory in Biblical research is to be accepted and made a part of faith and life until tested and attested by facts; if in the field of history, by the facts of history; if in the field of experience, by the facts of experience; and the Lord subjects even Scripture to this test, when he says, "If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself."

CHAPTER XV

Methods of Research; Archæological Material for Practical Uses in Bible Study

The joy of finding things, the joy of the faculty of wonder in exercise, is one of the greatest joys of life. It is not only the great joy of child life; it is the lure of the hunter, who pursues the furry and feathered tribes; the joy of the explorer, who seeks to add new lands to the political geography of the world; the joy of every research worker; the joy of the seeker after truth; and one of the greatest joys of sermon-making.

For the joy of finding things in the life of most Bible students, the Biblical field is not accessible. There are perhaps few theological students who do not aspire some day to visit Bible lands; there are almost as few who actually realize their young ambition in this regard. The necessary absence from one's field of labor; the time required for so long a journey; and now, above everything else, the enormous cost of such a journey; and all these hindrances working together cause that very few are ever able to search the Biblical field in person and get first-hand knowledge there.

Happily there is a Biblical field which is quite accessible; the Bible itself. So completely and accurately does it reflect the land and life in that land, that the mastery of what it presents in its imagery is the mastery of its meaning. Such a mastery makes one practically independent of commentaries. To see things as the Biblical writers saw them is to understand what they wrote.

Manifestly this Biblical field of exploration yields material for both apologetics and hermeneutics. This whole book is intended principally as an introduction to the use of archæological material in apologetics, marshalling, as it does, the evidence at strategic points to establish the trustworthiness of the Book. So it is not necessary especially to unfold here the method of research for material in apologetics; but rather in hermeneutics, the interpretation of scripture. Some directions may be given that the Bible student may go forward to an understanding, and independence in understanding, the precise meaning of revelation, however it may be couched in oriental idiom and customs.

Among the sources of material in hermeneutics there is, above all, the imagery of the Bible. The idiom of the original languages of the Bible with its embodiment of peculiar customs and manners is at once the key to the exact meaning of revelation and the most suggestive source of additional illustrations. The Hebrew and Greek lexicons are, in fact, the juiciest books in the minister's library, if only he knows how to get the juice out of them. No other source of information yields so much of illumination of the meaning, and so many and varied illustrations of the truth. Hebrew is a primitive language, still very near to nature; and nearly every word in the Old Testament is, in reality, a Word picture. That picture not only reveals the illustration of the truth intended, but suggests other illustrations from present-day life. Blessed is the expositor who is able to avail himself fully of this voluminous supply of illustration. Where

one's own knowledge is not quite adequate, the great Bible Dictionaries are at hand to supplement his own discoveries. Thus it is apparent that among the most valuable sources of information concerning the meaning of Scripture is

I. *Imagery.* Biblical language everywhere, and in the Old Testament especially, is full of nature imagery; as is, indeed, every primitive language. Many of the figures of speech are drawn directly from nature. The study of this imagery drawn from nature, not only where it appears in the English translation, but especially when it is only discovered by a sharp scrutiny of the original Hebrew, furnishes a never ending picture gallery of illustration.

Another source of imagery, quite similar to nature itself, is the etymology of words. Isaac in the Hebrew means "laughter," and Joseph, "addition" and Benjamin "son of right hand." These are but suggestive specimens of the multitudinous supply of illustrations that may be found or suggested in a study of the etymology of Hebrew words.

Again, history introduces many instances of imagery that are most illuminating. When Jeremiah would warn the people of the danger that hung over Jerusalem, he told them that unless they mended their ways Jerusalem would be made "as Shiloh." This at once harks back to the whole history of Shiloh which fell from its state of glory to the desolate condition in which it then was in the days of Jeremiah. The later books, especially the prophets, are filled with such historical imagery.

Mythology also is not shunned by the sacred writers in the search for striking figures of speech. "*Tehom,*" the great deep, is closely connected with the mythology of the east and was personified as the goddess *Tiamat.* Likewise, behemoth and leviathan, in the book of Job are not zoölogical, but mythological animals, the great terrors in the Egyptian underworld, *Tuat,* which according to Egyptian mythology threatened the immortality of the candidate for Paradise.

Perhaps the most fruitful of all sources of Biblical imagery is to be found in the progesss of doctrine, especially in the New Testament.

The great ceremonial system had been fulfilled and had passed away, yet Christ is now "our passover," and so, in the Epistles, especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the whole of the symbolical system is used as imagery with a Gospel meaning.

II. *Two kinds of imagery* must be very carefully distinguished in the use of figures of speech in the interpretation of Scripture. There is living imagery which is vital in the writer's mind and to be carried on to the reader; and there is also *fossil* imagery which is only imbedded in the words used; and is not to convey any signification whatever to the reader. When we say "This is a spring-like day," we are using living imagery; but when we say "This is Wednesday," the reference to the holy day of the old god Woden is but fossil imagery. It is not vital in the thought at all; we do not regard the day as in any sense, Woden's day. So when we speak of the "dogs of war," or the "dogs of Mars," we are not at all to be understood as believing in the god Mars. The distinction between

these kinds of imagery may be defined thus: living imagery is intended by the writer as an illustration of his meaning; fossil imagery is but the primary meaning of a word or phrase which is now used in a derived sense. The interpretation of Scripture needs to guard very carefully this distinction and it is sometimes not easy to do so.

It scarcely needs to be pointed out that narrative in the Bible, as elsewhere, is but the complex of the many images found in the words and phrases, and so becomes most fruitful in word pictures which not only are illustrations themselves, but are suggestive of many similar ones in the mind of the thoughtful student of Scripture.

If now, the student having before him the original Hebrew and Greek of the Biblical text, and equipped with even a moderate working knowledge of these languages, makes proper use of the Hebrew and Greek lexicons and of the abounding material found in Bible Dictionaries that are available on every hand, he will not only have little or no need of commentaries to understand the exact meaning of the passage under consideration, but will have before him an inexhaustible supply of Biblical imagery which is always fresh material for the pulpit. And this imagery in turn will, by the laws of suggestion, enable him to find innumerable illustrations from present-day life and conditions. Thus this method of research becomes most fruitful in illustrations, which are the very life of effective preaching.

PART III
PROGRESS

In any review of the results of archæological research in the Biblical field it is of the first importance to assign to the subject of identifications the first place, out of which it has often been crowded, and to chronology, in its present-day form, the last place, as being in the modern rigid conception of it, clearly not in the ancient Oriental mind at all.

Rightly to adjust ourselves between Israel's transcendent importance as the depositary of revelation and the channel of the world's hope of salvation, and Israel's international insignificance and the oft-repeated humiliation of her sovereignty as the football of empires is the great problem of the comparison between Bible history and archæological results in Bible lands.

CHAPTER XVI

The Beginnings of History

There has been given in Part II a systematic history of the bearing of the results of archæological research upon the questions raised by criticism, with a sufficient number of illustrations to make clear the nature of the results in all parts of the field. But this discussion of Archæology and Criticism would be incomplete without an orderly, symmetrical view of the Biblical narrative in the light in which the present results of archæological research make it to appear.

Much is said of the "assured results" of criticism. Perhaps it may not be presumptuous to make a modest presentation of what seems to be the "assured results" of archæology with a setting of the one over against the other that there may be an impartial judgment between the two. Such a contrast ought not to be necessary, or even possible. For it is quite true that there can be no conflict or contrast between the real results of archæological research and a correct criticism. But, to say the least, surely neither archæologists nor critics claim infallibility. Moreover they do not have infallibility, whether they claim it or not. "Assured results" are not as well "assured" on either side as they might be, for human fallibility mars all human research. So, nothing but willful blindness or blind willfulness can lead either critics or archæologists to ignore the fact that the "results" of archæological research generally accepted by archæologists and the "results" of

criticism usually set forth in these days as "assured" are out of harmony.

If, then, we get into the stream of Bible history and journey down it, noting by the way what seem to be "assured results" of archæological research and the light in which these "results" set out the Bible history and Bible literature and Bible tradition, the intelligent reader may be left to himself to decide whether the lack of harmony between the "assured results" of archæology as the archæologists see them and the "assured results" of criticism as the critics see them, is to be laid at the door of the archæologists or of the critics, and whether the correct setting of Scripture be the background which archæology provides or the background which criticism provides.

In noting archæological results along the devious course of the stream of Bible history we pass through, in regular order, five distinct periods of that history: First, The Patriarchal Period, The Beginnings of History, chiefly in Palestine and Egypt; Second, The Tribal Period, in Egypt, the Sinai Peninsula, and the Promised Land; Third, The National Period, chiefly in Palestine, throughout the rise, decline, and fall of the Israelite Empire; Fourth, The Evangelistic Period, Fifth, The Ecclesiastic Period in the East and in the West, from New Testament days on. Consideration of the last two of these will be omitted, as they have been throughout this book, not because unimportant, but because they have not so much to do with the consideration of the "present truth." At a later time they may be presented.

I. THE HANDMAIDS OF HISTORY

In this historical journey, as, indeed, in all historical study, there are three handmaids which will serve us. These three handmaids of history, in the order of their importance, are Geography, Ethnology, and Chronology.

The three important requisites of testimony in a court are the place, the person, and the time. However important the events narrated, the narrative does not constitute evidence unless the place can be given. If the place can be given, then there is some evidence, though the witness be not able to name the persons or give the date. If, in addition, he can name the persons, then very important testimony is afforded, though the time of the event be unknown to him. If, now, to the place and the persons he can add the exact date, the evidence is complete. It is important carefully to note this order here, for by a reversal of the order and a consequent minimizing of the importance of geography and topography in Biblical discussions and the thrusting of chronology into the first place, the results of archæological identifications have been belittled and the importance of critical difficulties about petty apparent discrepancies in dates greatly magnified.

Geography is first in importance in history as in evidence in court, for in the last analysis history is human testimony, what somebody said or wrote. No progress whatever toward intelligence in the study of history can be made until we have some answer to the question "Where?" and the better the answer the greater the progress. The most interesting and even startling story of events is no more to us than a legend

until we can in some way locate it, can fit it into a place in the world's history. So with the identification of the places in the Bible history; instead of being shoved aside, as of litle more than curious interest, they are to be received as of the first importance, without some more or less definite idea of which, nothing else is important at all.

But political geography is inseparably bound up with ethnology. Indeed, it is the existence of the various peoples that draws many of the lines of the various places, so that in the study of history, ethnography and geography have almost identical lines. The answer to the question "Where?" concerning any events of history usually gives practical answer to the question "Who?" But all the lights and shadows of the picture cannot be gotten aright without exact and detailed information upon the subject of ethnology. And exact answers to the questions "Where?" and "Who?" will give us real history even if we cannot answer the question "When?" and know little or nothing of the mere literary questions which are now so much thrust into the foreground of public attention.

Last of all in importance among the handmaids of history is chronology, which yet is made to play so important a part in the critical method; and it is of still less importance than it would otherwise be, because, while place and race are of the same significance now as of old, the world's conception of chronology has radically changed since the introduction of calendars made according to astronomical time and under the influence of the use of clocks and watches. By these means has come into general use an epochal chronology

which arranges all history primarily in lines of succession; and there has come at the same time a mathematical exactness in the noting of time of which ancient peoples of Bible lands hardly dreamed. Without these ideas, they necessarily viewed history rather upon planes of contemporaneity and, where they looked along lines of succession at all, gave more attention to the order and perspective of events than to the flight of time. Man's relation to life rather than his relation to time was the informing principle of their historical records.

The attempt to force all the statements of Biblical writers into a scheme of epochal chronology according to astronomical time is responsible for no little of the confusion which criticism sees. If the critics would give more time to arranging the characters of ancient history upon the field and among their fellows where those characters are well acquainted than to the attempt to fit them into a chronological system to which they were strangers, much more naturalness and harmoniousness would be found in the Bible story. The critical method at this point is wholly illogical. The chronological statements of the ancients must be considered from the standpoint of their chronological conceptions, not ours. We must *ask* a man what he means, not *tell* him.

Now in any review of the results of archæological research it is of first importance to give all these handmaids of history their proper order and consideration, to assign to the subject of identifications the first place, out of which it has been crowded, and to chronology in its present-day form, the last place, as being, in the modern conception of it, clearly not in the ancient Oriental mind at all.

The possibility of the results of research giving a vision of the historical setting of the Bible, harmonious, reasonable, complete, satisfying, must be the final test of the archæological method, and, if that method be brought to a satisfactory degree of perfection, the final test also of the Biblical narrative. If archæology can never present a complete, reasonable, harmonious, vision of the historical setting of the Bible then as a method it will fall short, and cannot be finally conclusive. And if the method can attain to such satisfactory degree of perfection, then the Biblical narrative must stand or fall before it. For at the last analysis, the results of archæological research are neither more nor less than the vision of the "historical imagination" in the concrete, the mental picture of the times of the Bible turned into hard, material facts. It supplies the actual setting into which Scripture ought to fit, and, if it be true, will fit. Though research is able to supply only a few points irregularly placed round about the whole circumference of the events, yet the narrative, if true, will exactly fit at every one of these points, as the correct ground-plan of a house exactly fits upon the few remaining, disconnected parts of the foundation which a destructive fire has left.

The value and importance of the results of archæological research in Bible study consists especially in providing facts with which to test theories and in searching for Bible history in the field, supplying such results as do turn the "historical imagination" into the concrete to such an extent as to prove up or to discredit the whole territory. The former of these, the providing of facts with which to test theories, has

been discussed in Parts I and II. It remains to take up now, in Part III, the larger and more constructive work of so making an archæological survey of the Biblical field as to determine, if possible, the degree of the integrity and trustworthiness of the Biblical records.

It may well be asked, Can archæological evidence do this? And it will be profitable, preparatory to that survey, to consider and illustrate the possibility of reaching any definite and reliable conclusions concerning historical documents of such extent and vitally important character by means of such fragmentary evidence as archæological research supplies. It is better to determine this question upon is own merits before attempt is made to apply such evidence to so important a case as Bible history.

Those who search for coal lands in which to invest and who find what seems to them a hopeful territory, proceed to test it. They make a boring and find at a certain depth, between certain geological strata, a layer of coal of a certain quality and thickness. Then at another distant point in the territory they make another test boring, then another and another and another, at points properly related to each other, around the edge of the land and through the center. Perhaps, if they are unusually cautious, they sink a shaft at one of these points and drive a tunnel through the coal to another. If, now, they find at the same depth, between the same geological strata, the same vein of good coal at all these points and even continuous and uniform in the connecting tunnel, they will be perfectly satisfied that that stratum of coal underlies the whole territory.

Ancient history, indeed all history, lies in layers; layers in the ascent of civilization, and actual, material, layers in the *débris* left on the surface of the earth in undisturbed places. The archæologist is not able to uncover the whole territory; some portions, indeed, have been disturbed and the layers of history destroyed. But when he has made several test examinations, at far distant and properly distributed points, and has found at the same period, between the same historical strata, a certain layer of history, and especially when he has been in a few cases able to connect some of these distant points and has found the same layer of history continuous and uniform, he also may conclude unhesitatingly that similar history underlies the whole territory, though he is able to touch it at but few places.

Or take another illustration of a very different character. Between Florence and Venice lies the snow-capped range of the Apennines. One's train draws out from Florence amidst the fertile gardens and vineyards of the valley and begins the ascent of the mountain to cross over. In a little time one enters a long tunnel and emerges high up among the olive orchards. After a few moments he plunges again into the mountain, circling round and round and coming out far above the vineyards and olive groves among the oaks and chestnuts. His eyes are scarcely accustomed to this pleasant view until he rushes again into the darkness. Round and around he goes in the bowels of the mountain only to appear once more in the blazing sunlight, this time among the conifers and stunted mountain oaks. For a last time he enters a dark hole rushes on in the gloom to reappear at the summit of the

pass amidst the everlasting snow. Then down, down, around and around, in and out, until he reaches the beautiful eastern plain of Italy, and sees the gardens and the vineyards once more about him.

Now, he has in fact seen but very little of the Apennines. He has been going in and out of holes and catching only glimpses of the mountain range, but he can have no doubt that he has crossed over from one side to the other.

So the Biblical archæologist does not see everything as he crosses any range of ancient history. He goes in and out of holes and only catches glimpses of things; nevertheless he does get at last a persuasion, an irresistible persuasion, of the existence and character of the whole territory.

The fact is that fragmentary evidence, if it be unequivocal and properly distributed and interrelated, may decide conclusively concerning a very large territory, much of which is, in detail, untouched. This is equally true whether the territory be on the surface of the earth or on the plane of human history. So that the fragmentary evidence produced by archæological research, if it be properly distributed and interrelated, may conclusively attest the existence and character of a very large scope of history, though a great portion of that history be still untouched.

Having thus examined and illustrated the validity of the archæological method of proving up the Biblical field, let us now, as rapidly as possible, survey that field and see the Biblical narrative as it appears in the present light from archæological research. Since Part II deals with illustrations of Bible history from

archæology, and Part III is to give a comprehensive view of the Bible as archæological research makes it appear, it is inevitable and indeed, desirable, that some repetition in the use of materials and occasionally even in statements should occur.

Served by the handmaids of history and having this view of the effectiveness of archæological evidence before us, we turn now, to consider

II. THE DISPERSION

The Lord planted a garden "eastward in Eden." The streams mentioned in connection with this garden form the great Euphrates system. The garden was located, according to the description given in the Bible, somewhere toward the lower part of the great valley. For a river "went out of Eden to water the garden" and from the garden it was divided "into four heads," not "four mouths." A garden so situated could not have been very far up the stream; must, at least, have been as far down as where all the four branches were united into one stream. The garden has not been definitely located by archæological evidence; but it is very significant that all traceable lines of the world's great emigrations, when followed back toward the beginning, invariably center from all parts of the world toward a certain small area in western Asia.

The historical method of the Bible in its early parts and, indeed, in a general way throughout, is to give the history of the Gentile nations first in brief outline and then the account of the chosen line of revelation and redemption more in detail.[1]

Of the first dispersion of the human race over the surface of the earth we know almost absolutely nothing aside from the statements of the Bible. Of speculation, scientific theory, there is much that is reasonable; but of real historical statement there is nothing else that presents even a reasonable claim. The second dispersion, however, as recorded in the Bible is being exactly, and as investigation progresses, more and more fully, confirmed by the results of archæological research. That from a central point, somewhere in Mesopotamia, the Hamitic branch of the race migrated to the southwest, the Japhetic branch to the northwest, and the Semitic branch "eastward" toward the "land of Shinar" is indisputable. As the details of these race movements emerge from obscurity, the meager account in Genesis x is not discredited; rather, little by little, it is being confirmed. Not all of the subdivisions of the race are positively identified at the place in which they appear on the map of Biblical geography, but of many of them there can be little doubt and they correspond to the lines of emigration laid down in Genesis x.

III. THE RISE OF CIVILIZATIONS

The rise of civilizations is yet involved in almost as much obscurity as the dispersion of men over the earth. The time was, when, aside from the Bible, Herodotus set the bounds of our historical knowledge on this subject. Then, little by little, research among the ruins of ancient civilization gave glimmerings of light along the course which Herodotus followed and even beyond the bounds to which he reached. Some years ago, Professor Maspero showed the farthest reach

of archæological research in his *Dawn of Civilization,* a learned and ambitious work which thought to speak the last word. It was scarcely given to the world before it was put out of date by fresh discoveries. And the laudable ambition of that distinguished scholar has drifted away far beyond his reach or the reach of any other in the present generation. Yet, notwithstanding this, the Bible account stands for all scholars on the horizon. It tells of the beginnings of civilization without dates. The facts it gives are being glimpsed by research. The outlines of the picture are coming out of the darkness as the image on the photographic plate comes out under the hand of the operator in the dark room. As these outlines appear, they are the outlines sketched in the Bible account of the rise of civilizations. Beyond that statement we cannot go as yet.

The Bible gives us the beginnings of the mingling of Hamitic and Semitic civilizations, the great civilizations of the Old World. The descendants of Japheth, that part of the human family which stands for the acme of civilization today, scarce come into notice at all for that age of the world either in the Bible or out of it.

The first Babylonian civilization, according to the Bible, was Hamitic, by a son of Cush.[1] According to archæological research[2] it was Sumerian, or Accadian, but who the Sumerians or Accadians were archæology answers not, except that they *were not Semitic people;* they had not a Semitic language, and their faces are not at all those of Semites.[3] The heroic element in the Bible story of "Nimrod the mighty hunter," may not properly be pressed for either mythological elements

or evidence of rude and barbarous conditions, lest we may be somewhat embarrassed when there comes to mind the hunting expeditions of Rameses II at the highest pinnacle of Egyptian civilization, or still more embarrassed even to the verge of the ludicrous when we consider the sportsmanship of European monarchs of the present time, or turn to one of the late books from the American press recounting the exploits of a "mighty hunter" who ruled the great American Republic in the beginning of the xxth century A.D.

The relation between the civilization of Babylonia and that of Egypt is much discussed by archæologists, which means, of course, that each civilization has its advocates. The salient facts are these: that the early Horus worshippers in Egypt were invaders who came from the south, or southeast, from the direction of the land of Cush, and that the early Babylonian civilization was Sumerian, not Semitic, which the Bible says was also Cushite. These facts, exactly in accord with the Biblical record, account for the similarities between the civilization of the two lands of the east river and of the west, and that without making either civilization dependent upon the other. The priority of the Babylonian civilization, is however, quite generally conceded. There is nothing in the Bible account of the rise of civilizations to indicate that they are given in any regular order, much less to make certain that the order of time is always the order followed, or whether some other determining factor may not be recognized in the order adopted. It may be that here, as elsewhere, the relation to the course of the history of redemption determines both

order and perspective. It is most interesting, however, to note that the order of the earliest civilizations is thus exactly the order in which they are mentioned in the Bible account.

Out of Babylonia "went forth Asshur and builded Ninevah." It is a most remarkable thing that out of an Hamitic civilization in Babylonia, Semitic territory, there went Semites to found a Semitic civilization in Assyria. Yet this seemingly absurd representation of history in the Bible fits well into what is known by research of the rise of civilizations in that part of the world. Civilization in Babylonia, which appears as Semitic territory, first emerged under the leadership of Nimrod "the mighty hunter" from Hamitic Cush. Semites journeyed "eastward,"—how long after the Flood we are not told,—and "found a plain in the land of Shinar." That eventually there might be disagreement between these Semites and a Hamitic civilization, and that a Semitic leader should go out with a Semitic emigration and found Nineveh is quite human and to be expected.

Of the beginnings of Egyptian occupation, nothing is known, and of the beginnings of Egyptian civilization, very little. It is generally accepted that the aborigines were Hamitic, as represented in the Bible, but so far as archæological evidence goes it is little more than an assumption. The rise of civilization, if such an epoch may be said to be marked by Egyptian research, seems to have been, as has been said, at the invasion of the Horus worshipers[1] out of the south, from the region of the Cushites. Thus, in the beginning, Egyptian civilization was imposed by one branch of the

Hamitic family upon another. This little that is known is quite in harmony with the account of early Egyptian history in the Bible.

Canaanite civilization is the strangest mixture of all, whether we consider the Bible account or the findings of research. Hebrew is, according to the Bible representation, the "language of Canaan."[1] And as far back as it has been as yet possible to learn anything in that land by archæological research it is still found to be so. But Canaan was of the sons of Ham, and the researches which have revealed the troglodyte inhabitants[2] as the earliest in Palestine seem pretty clearly to indicate that *they were not Semitic people*.[3] The indications are for a Semitic language and civilization among what was originally a Hamitic population; not more anomalous than a Cushite civilization in Babylonia out of which went Semitic people to found Semitic civilization in Assyria. The probability is, however, that eventually Hamitic civilization will be found to have preceded the dominance of the Semitic tongue in Canaan.

The Arabian civilization in that mysterious "East," "the Khedem" of Job,[4] of Balaam,[5] of the Wise Men,[6] and of the traditions of Egypt, is still left by research in as great mystery as surrounds it in the Bible, with this important exception, that its existence at a very early period as represented in the Bible is confirmed by the Egyptian record of the travels of Sinuhit.[7]

European civilization is entirely omitted from the Bible account of early history. Did the brief outline of ethnographic and ethnologic beginnings in Genesis x antedate the inception of European progress? or was

nothing known or revealed to the Biblical writers concerning it; or, more probably, is nothing said in the Bible concerning European progress because European civilization lay outside the scope of the history of redemption at that period?

Thus the results of archæological research accord with the Scripture representations concerning the rise of civilizations as to *order, importance, and relationships*. That the strange commingling and yet distinction of Semitic and Hamitic civilization and influences in Babylonia and Canaan should be substantiated by the meager results of research to such a remarkable degree is very significant of the trustworthiness of the Biblical account. This is not to be expected of legend or myth. Could it by any possibility occur?

CHAPTER XVII

The Beginnings of History—Continued

IV. THE SOURCE AND COURSE OF SEMITIC CULTURE

We proceed now to the more particular examination of history in detail. Whatever may be the original source and course of Semitic culture, whether arising in Babylonia and passing westward, as long universally held, or rising in the westland and going eastward, as now plausibly urged by some,[1] in any case, at the beginning of the history of revealed religion, as it took its rise from Abraham, Babylonia was dominant in Palestine. The representation of this in Genesis xiv has been called the "storm center" of Biblical criticism of the early historical period, because the historicity of the story of Babylonian interference and Babylonian domination recorded in that chapter has been so steadily scouted by many important critics.

V. BABYLONIAN INFLUENCE IN CANAAN

But this Babylonian domination in Palestine, not only then but before and after that time, has been so abundantly and absolutely attested[2] that it can hardly any longer be the subject of serious discussion. The importance of the Bible narrative of domination given in Genesis xiv arises almost wholly out of the fact that it is the only insight into that domination which the Bible gives for that period and not from any special importance, for general history, of the events men-

tioned in it. The incidents there recorded were of comparatively small importance in the affairs of a great empire; though, considered in itself, the campaign was brilliant and successful, but very brief.

It must be carefully noted that the narrative at this point in the Bible is the narrative of the capture of Lot and his rescue by Abraham. General history is only parenthetically introduced in verses 4 to 9 to explain the situation. But it is the general history, and the place in it into which the special narrative fits with which criticism has been so much concerned, and which archæological research has served to illustrate.

The beginnings of Babylonian domination in Palestine are as far back as the time of Sargon I,[1] whose generally accepted date has been about 3800 B.C., though some would now put it much later than that. The domination appears again in the time of Gudea, who brought limestone "from the land of the Amorite." Of the confederacy of Elamite and Babylonian kings not much is clearly and definitely known, but a close relation between the two lands, with now one and now the other in the ascendency, is well known. At the time of Abraham "the land of the Amorite" was regarded as an integral part of the Babylonian empire.[2] Not all the allies in this campaign to Palestine are known certainly as yet. Amraphel is usually identified with Hammurabi,[3] though there are a few important scholars who dissent.[4] It must be admitted, however, in spite of these voices of dissent, that the general view of the great Elamite lawgiver is that he is the Amraphel of the expedition that captured Lot. Few kings of the ancient world are better known than

he, for, in addition to the famous Code that bears his name, about ninety of his letters and other brief documents have been found and translated.[1]

Chedorlaomer as an individual king of Elam is not identified, but the elements which compose his name are quite familiar in royal names of that period.[2] Tidal, "king of Goiim," is probably correctly identified with "Tudkhulu,"[3] a Hittite king whom it was necessary to include in the alliance lest an enemy be left in the rear. Of Arioch nothing is certainly known under this form of his name, but there is very strong evidence, which has convinced many cuneiform scholars from the days of Rawlinson and George Smith onward, that Rim-Sin is a Semitic equivalent of the Elamitic name Arioch.[4]

The geographic notes of the campaign recorded in Genesis xiv show that it took a wide sweep from Damascus, on the north, far down to the wilderness of Paran, on the south, then back west of the Jordan to the cities of the Plain, crushing the rebellion everywhere and carrying off plunder, doubtless, from every place. The Bible has no room for any account of the general despoiling of the land, but only of the plundering of the cities of the Plain and the capture of Lot.

The great army was well started on its return journey, the rebellion crushed, the campaign finished, the edge of the rebellious territory reached, when Abraham with a few men came up in his pursuit, hung on the rear of the army, made a night attack upon the guard of the baggage train and the prisoners, raided a portion of the train, recovered Lot and his personal belongings among other spoil, and made off in the darkness. The

importance given to this narrative in the Bible is because of its importance in the Bible story; the little that is given of the general history here is simply as a setting for that story. On the other hand, the insignificance of the rescue as an affair in the campaign of the allied kings from the East is apparent at once upon consideration of the whole campaign. The imperial authority has been reëstablished in all that vast region in the "land of the Amorite," including the cities of the Plain. The long march homeward having been begun, they, a great army, would not turn back for a night foray like this or for the escape of a few prisoners and the loss of a little plunder. A few "petty sheiks of the desert," as these allied kings have once been called, might have given heed to such an attack, not so the imperial armies during the conduct of a great campaign.

The general historicity of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, involving as it does the greater subject of the dominance of Babylonian or Elamitic influence in Palestine in the early patriarchal age, can no longer reasonably be questioned. The attempted recrudescence of the destructive theory at this point by Dr. Driver[1] in the Seventh Edition of his *Genesis*, if one may yield to the temptation to be facetious on such a subject, puts us in mind amusingly of the sometime attempt of strawberry plants to blossom in the autumn.

How much did Babylonian domination mean for Palestinian civilization? How much does foreign domination mean to the manners, customs, laws, institutions, and culture of any land? We may as safely theorize upon the one question as upon the other.

Speculation on this subject is well-nigh hopeless. It is speculation at this point which has brought criticism into so much difficulty in the understanding of the Biblical record of these times. The effect of foreign domination at any time, in any place, and among any people, can be determined only by actual observation of the facts. Little, if anything, may be assumed. The possibilities are so numerous and varied that alternative suppositions become so complex and confusing as to be impracticable, as will appear. Sometimes foreign domination is content with making the native ruler a vassal with mere tokens of vassalage; sometimes a new king is appointed from the people, and the internal government of the land is allowed to remain practically unchanged, and the manners and customs wholly so; sometimes there is a foreign ruler put on the throne, accompanied by a partial or, it may be, complete change of institutions, laws, and customs; sometimes the old native language is used by the new government without disturbance, and sometimes a new official court language is introduced, and, when that is done, sometimes it takes hold upon the people and displaces temporarily or even permanently the native tongue, and sometimes the two coalesce and both lose, in that land, their identity in the composite language. Since such varied experiences are observed in the history of the world, it becomes imperative that criticism should wait upon observation for the reconstructing of the historical setting of the patriarchal age in Palestine. How much, then, did Babylonian suzerainty in Palestine in patriarchal days affect manners, customs, laws, institutions, culture, and refinement?

The patriarchs and their followers were not wild, roving bands, but semi-nomads. It has been most convenient in the evolutionary history to suppose a nomadic life for the patriarchs. But archæological information, harmonizing entirely with the very plain representations of Scripture, gives a civilization for that age consistent only with the semi-nomadic life made known to us in the Biblical account of the patriarchs; a state of civilization quite similar to that found in the grazing sections of America and Australia a quarter of a century ago, though, of course, in Palestine on a much smaller scale. There were cities and a well-established government all over the land, with yet much freedom of movement in the grazing districts, and much simplicity of manners in all country life. There were local vassal kings, some of whom, as those of the cities of the Plain, attempted to throw off the yoke.[1] The payment of tithes which is illustrated by Abraham giving tithes to Melchizedek was a regular Babylonian custom of which Babylonian tablets[2] furnish abundant illustration.

Then, the Code of Hammurabi,[3] promulgated far away in the imperial capital of the East, when held up as a mirror to the conduct of men in Palestine in patriarchal times as recorded in the Bible, is seen to be equally in force in the far western province of the empire, the "land of the Amorite." So that Palestine in that age, so far from being a semi-barbarous land, was under one of the simplest and most orderly and symmetrical codes[4] of civil and criminal laws ever in force in any land.

The law of adoption is illustrated in the home life and the hopes of Abraham. He says: "And, lo, one born in my house is mine heir." In the Code (law 191) we read: "If a man, after a young child whom he has taken to his sonship and brought up, has made a house for himself and acquired children, and has set his face to cut off the nursling, that child shall not go his way, the father that brought him up shall give to him from his goods one-third of this sonship, he shall go off; from field garden and house he shall not give him." How many had been born in Abraham's house we know not. Thus far they were his only heirs according to the law. This was his complaint.

The conduct of Sarah in giving her maid to her husband and the treatment of Hagar for sneering at her childless mistress were all according to the law. The Code (law 146) says: "If a man has espoused a votary, and she has given a maid to her husband and she has borne children, afterwards, that maid has made herself equal with her mistress, because she has borne children her mistress shall not sell her for money, she shall put a mark upon her and count her among the maidservants."

The marriage dower and some of the customs connected with it appear in the account of the betrothal of Rebecca. The Code (law 160) prescribes that "if a man has brought in a present to the house of his father-in-law, has given a dower, and the father of the daughter has said, 'My daughter I will not give thee,' he shall make up and return everything that he brought him." There are several laws relating to the dower under various circumstances.

The threat of burning made by Judah against his daughter-in-law Tamar has also, probably, its justification in the Code (law 110) where there seem to be some euphemistic terms. "If a votary, a lady who is not living in a convent, has opened a wine shop or has entered a wine shop for drink that woman one shall burn."

The laws of contract, also, make us to know more exactly of the process at the gate of Hebron between Abraham and the "sons of Heth." In the laws of contract in the Code, among others we have (law 7): "If a man has bought silver, gold, manservant or maidservant, ox or sheep or ass or anything whatever its name, from the hand of a man's son, or of a man's slave, without witness and bonds, that man has acted the thief, he shall be put to death," This law refers specifically to dealings with minors and slaves, but it shows the customs of formal contract among the people with "witness and bonds."

These numerous harmonies, so widely extended, and as varied in character as contracts, inheritances, and criminal executions, furnish conclusive evidence that the other wise seemingly capricious conduct of the patriarchs was in strict conformity, in each individual case, with statutory law. Such regularity of law-abiding conduct can be explained only on the supposition of a well-established government and a law-abiding people, *a reign of law*, in fact, equal to that found in some of the most highly civilized lands of today.

Thus the only objection *in fact*, aside from the objections arising from the demands of the evolutionary *theory* of patriarchal history, which could be made to

the historical character of the patriarchal narrative (*i.e.*, the startling and seemingly inexplicable acts in the conduct of the patriarchs and others associated with their history), not only is fully met but is met in such a way by exact, incidental agreement between isolated acts of conduct and particular laws in a Code promulgated at the Imperial seat of government one thousand miles away, as gives to the history the same convincing appearance of reality that is given to the record of the conformity, in early Colonial days, of the acts of the settlers to the quaint laws of New England, or of the ways of the English people in the XVIth century to the laws and customs of old England then in force.

CHAPTER XVIII

The Patriarchal Period

I. The Palestinian Civilization in the Patriarchal Age

If we turn from this contemplation of settled institutions and law-abiding people to inquire to what extent Babylonian refinement and culture had influenced Palestine and more exactly to what height of culture the people of Palestine, under such influence, had then attained (for even an indigenous culture may be much affected by outside influences) we will find, if possible, a still more surprising state of society.

A correct estimate of a particular age, as the Abrahamic age now under consideration, cannot be had without bringing into view a much longer period. It is very seldom that anywhere in the world the refinement and culture of a given century can be blocked off by itself for consideration independent of what precedes and also of what follows; for the real character of a culture can be fully known only by its fruits, which are sometimes very slow to ripen.

As far back as the time of Naram-Sin[1] (about 3750 B.C.), the Babylonian postal system had been established which reached as far as Palestine. Such a public convenience always meets a need of the people. The need for a postal system among people cannot arise except from a considerable diffusion of the knowledge of letters, both how to read and how to write. Indeed,

such a public convenience as a postal system by no means comes as a certainty even in a high state of civilization and where there is a wide diffusion of learning, but has usually marked only the greatest enlightenment.

Much has now been learned of the ceramic art of the earliest times in Palestine. From all excavations in the land have come good specimens; and from the earliest time, as shown at Taanach[1] and Gezer,[2] there are bowls, vases, and dishes of beautiful shapes and excellent workmanship. Yet with all this, the best view of articles of art and luxurious refinement in the patriarchal age is to be obtained from an examination of the list of booty gathered from Canaan by Thothmes III[3] during the Israelite sojourn in Egypt. It makes the picture of Canaanite luxury, which the Bible paints with a few touches, seem very moderate, indeed, commonplace. There are inlaid and gilded chairs and tables and a golden plow and scepter, richly embroidered clothes, a chariot chased with silver, jeweled tent-poles, gold-plated chariots, iron armor inlaid with gold, a helmet of gold inlaid with lapis-lazuli. Such a collection of Oriental articles of luxurious refinement could not be duplicated and scarcely approached in richness by robbing all the Museums of the world today. Yet these things came out of patriarchal Palestine.

Then the fact of the Tell Amarna tablets,[4] without considering the contents of the tablets at all, has a significance for the culture of Palestine in that and the preceding age, which can hardly be overestimated. At the time of the writing of these tablets, Babylonian political dominance was at an end in Palestine. It had been supplanted by Egyptian control and this

now was slipping away, apparently, before some sort of patriotic spirit of "Canaan for the Canaanites." Yet so great had been the influence of Babylonian culture, so great the advancement which the people of Palestine had made in refinement under it, that we find many, we might almost say all, sorts of people still writing letters in that most difficult of all scripts, the cuneiform, which requires schools, and years of patient toil, for its acquisition. This state of things had continued for a long time notwithstanding that Egypt, the then dominant political power in the land, had a hieroglyphic system much easier to learn. Since the Babylonian culture of this time could not have arisen in the land after the Babylonian political dominance was so thoroughly displaced by the hostile Egyptian power, this can only mean that the Babylonian literary culture in Palestine was so high and so thoroughly established that it had continued from the Babylonian period down far into the time of the Egyptian suzeranity, and was still so dominant that even the Egyptian court felt constrained to use the Babylonian language and script in its correspondence with its Palestinian provinces. From these facts, we may learn how indelibly the literary culture of Babylonia had been impressed upon Palestine in the preceding age, the time of Abraham, to have endured through such seemingly irresistible adverse influences.

II. THE FIRST PILGRIM FATHER

Into such a Palestine, of such civilization, such refinements, such literary attainments, Abraham, the first pilgrim father, immigrated. There was a divine call at a favorable opportunity. Was there ever a divine

call to any one at other than a favorable opportunity? God's grace works through both providence and revelation, and all things of His grace, whether through providence or through revelation, are in the "fullness of time." The introduction and establishment in Palestine of not only the Babylonian tongue but the difficult Babylonian script, and such general diffusion of the knowledge of that language and script that it came to be used by all classes of people, evidences beyond question a large movement of populations from Babylonia to Palestine. Whether it began by military occupation or by voluntary emigration is not known, nor is it of vital importance that it should be known. However the movement may have begun, no such introduction of the language and script of Babylonia could be brought about without the continued presence of considerable numbers of Babylonians in the "land of the Amorite."

Abraham was called to join this movement of populations, not simply as a man of affairs seeking to better his worldly condition, but as one called to a great mission. He was called to be the first pilgrim father, to take advantage of the movement from the scenes of Babylonia and its idolatrous religion to the frontier of the empire, there to lay the foundations of a theocracy. He went out, as does every other emigrant, to a strange land and a new life, *i.e.*, "not knowing whither he went."

Not for long do we follow the journeyings of Abraham before a new light begins to break upon us concerning his career. He soon appears not as a mere individual, but as a Prince, the head of a clan, for his father had died in Haran. These clans of the East are anomalous

in government, but existent in fact, whether called Arabs, as in the Bible history, or Shashu by the Egyptians, or Bedouin, as in modern times. That such princes of clans should exist in orderly, well-established government is very perplexing according to our modern ideas, but no more perplexing in the Babylonian government in Palestine in the time of Abraham than in Turkish rule in the same region today. A little later this princely character of Abraham appears very clearly in the independent way in which he proceeds to the division of the land between Lot and himself as though there were no others in the land to be consulted, and again in the pursuit of the captives and the plunder from the Cities of the Plain with a company of three hundred and eighteen men and some friends, acting throughout entirely upon his own authority. This princely character of Abraham is the key to much in his career and the overlooking of it has been the opportunity for the introduction of much confusion into the interpretation of his career.

III. THE PATRIARCHAL RECEPTION IN EGYPT

Very early in the sojourn of Abraham in the land of promise an incident occurred which turns our eyes to an entirely new quarter of the horizon of Palestinian history in the Bible. We have heretofore seen the light shining in only from the east. Now, for the first time in Bible story, light from Egypt falls across the page of Palestinian history. There came a famine in Canaan. Two significant events took place as a result of this famine. Abraham went to Egypt for succor, and there he was shown by the Egyptians royal

distinction. Insignificant private citizens are not accorded such consideration. There is here an imperative demand for either a belief in a suitable historical setting for these events or a frank acknowledgment of a mythical element in the narrative. The historical setting has been coming to light slowly for many years, yet has but recently reached a satisfactory stage of progress. Brugsch[1] long ago discovered conclusive evidence of a Semitic language among the inhabitants of the region about Zoan. Here was used a Semitic tongue of such influence that many of its words persisted all down through the transformation of the old Egyptian language into the Coptic and the breaking up of the Coptic into dialects and the incorporation of the traditions of that region into Arabic literature. These Semitic people seem originally to have been Phœnicians. Phœnicia, like Portugal and Holland and England in turn, in later times, was mistress of the sea. The Egyptians were averse to much intercourse with foreigners, so that by some arrangement, probably one which was the growth of centuries, the Phœnicians came to do the foreign business of the Egyptians much as the English, the French and the Germans long did the foreign business of the Chinese.

Then there came a time when the desert people, for some reason now unknown, pushed their way into the Delta of Egypt. Bedouin Princes lodged there, abode there, and at last usurped the power and the throne of Egypt for all the northern kingdom, and put to vassalage the princes of the southern kingdom. For some five centuries the Hyksos,[2] in Egyptian, "Haq Shashu," "Bedouin Princes," held the scepter at Zoan.

Their entrance into Egypt has been laid bare by Petrie at Tell el-Yehudiyeh.[1] They were in power when Abraham went down into Egypt and for a long time afterward.

It seems to be assumed also in Genesis[2] that there was some knowledge of the true God among these Bedouin Princes on the throne of Egypt. Although it is perfectly clear from Egyptian history that they took up, at least formally and officially, with the religion of Egypt, yet, in the conversation between the patriarchs Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph, and the Pharaohs of Egypt, there seems to be a constant assumption on the part of the patriarchs that the Pharaohs understood all their references to God without explanation; and the Pharaoh is represented as replying, especially to Joseph, in a way that implies such understanding. Apparently there was perfect mutual understanding, perhaps sympathy.

Why should not Abraham, a Bedouin Prince, go down into Egypt for succor and be treated royally there? Though himself an inhabitant of a Babylonian province, he had many affiliations with Egypt. He would find a Semitic dialect spoken there and he could transact his business with the first cousins of his race, the Phœnicians. Bedouin Princes were upon the throne; and among princes, a prince is a prince however small his principality. Perhaps he might even feel in Egypt a touch of sympathy in his religious beliefs and aspirations. Thus the suitable historical setting for the strange relations of the patriarchs with the Pharaohs of Egypt is supplied and the alternative demand for the admission of a mythical element in the stories passes away.[3]

The bold rescue of Lot and his stolen goods by a night attack on the plunder train of the returning victorious army of the confederate kings is only such an episode as frequently occurs in the lands where dwell the Bedouin Princes of the East. The great machinery of a campaign of the Imperial armies could not be stopped for a few night-riders. Even some portions of America have, within a few years tolerated many unredressed forays of "night-riders." In this case also very little has been done by the general government to overtake the mysterious marauders.

IV. DESTRUCTION OF THE CITIES OF THE PLAIN

The Xenia Seminary expedition to the Cities of the Plain,[1] in coöperation with the American School of Oriental Research at Jerusalem, both by discoveries made and by wellknown previous discoveries correlated, has established the authenticity of the account in Genesis concerning the Cities of the Plain and their destruction.

The civilization represented in the Bible story, that of the early Bronze Age, 2500–1800 B. C., the civilization of Abraham and Lot and of Sodom and Gomorrah, was clearly established, by indubitable evidence, to have been on the Plain at that time. The High Place at Bab ed-Dra'a with its seven pillars together with its adjoining cemetery manifestly for important personages was of this early Canaanite civilization, positively identified as belonging to that period by the pottery from the graves.

Here was not any one of the cities of the Plain, nor any other city, but the great High Place of all of

them, a place to which they came up at special seasons for worship, as did Israel to Gilgal and later to Shiloh. The importance of this High Place is shown by the formidable fortress, about twelve hundred feet in length which protected it from raids by wild tribesmen of the mountains before the civilization of Moab began.

But this civilization abruptly ceased on the Plain. The most careful search of the Plain from one end to the other, with soundings down to virgin sand and gravel, especially at Arabic Zoar, showed that from the end of the Early Bronze Age, about 1800 B. C., on to the end of the Biblical period, in fact till Byzantine times, there was no civilization of any kind on the Plain. This exactly consists with the silence of Biblical history concerning civilization on the Plain from the destruction of the Cities onward. Here is one instance when negative evidence becomes positive.

The prophecy of Ezekiel[1] concerning the return of the captivity of Sodom is now found also to be well on in its fulfillment. Notwithstanding the lugubrious accounts so often given of conditions of life on this Plain, it was found that the correct description of the natural conditions of the Plain before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, and now that the captivity of Sodom is returned is, indeed, "As the garden of the Lord." With excellent water from the red sandstone of Moab, salubrious climate and romantic scenery, it is suited for an ideal winter health resort.

All the elements of the great tragedy narrated in the Bible identified a quarter of a century ago by Wright

and also by Blanckenkorn, are found still *in situ:* a burned out region of oil and asphalt; a great rock-salt stratum exposed six miles in length and 150 feet thick; free sulphur which lies over the Plain now and mingles with the marl which overlies the salt, teach exactly the location of the tragedy. Such ruins do not move around.

The rising of the Dead Sea since the days of Abraham by reason of the filling in the delta of the Jordan at the north end of the Sea, has resulted, especially since the beginning of the Christian era, in the Sea running over at the southern edge and flooding the Plain. There, in a few feet of water and mud, the ruined Cities hide their shame. The High Place and the Cemetery of their noble dead being upon higher ground is still to be seen.

Lot, as the progenitor of Moabite civilization, is also confirmed by the pottery found at the old Kir of Moab and the ruined temple at Adar in the mountains of Moab. The pottery from the Kir of Moab shows clearly that it was in existence at the time of the end of the wilderness journey, when Moses passed this way, being the pottery of that late Bronze Age; and the pottery at the temple at Adar shows that the earliest period of that civilization was in the Middle Bronze Age which immediately succeeded the destruction of the Cities of the Plain.

V. THE BEGINNINGS OF REVELATION AND OF ISRAEL'S INSTITUTIONS

Two important steps in the progress of revelation at this period find archæological illustration. We have absolutely nothing concerning the introduction of cir-

cumcision into Israel as a religious rite except what is in the Bible. But that it became, among the Israelites, a religious rite must be accounted for. Among other peoples circumcision existed, but not as a religious rite. Especially is it known to have been practiced among the Egyptians. But the pictured representations there give no indication that it was anything but a surgical operation.[1] Herodotus says it was used by the Egyptians for sanitary reasons.[2] Only among the Israelites did it become a sacrament. There is nothing improbable whatever in the narrative that places the beginning of this national sacrament in the days of the father of the faithful.

Much more light is now shed upon the question of human sacrifice in Palestine. The gruesome hints in the Bible of such Canaanite practices long continuing even after the incoming of the Israelites, and the yielding, in some measure, of the Israelites to the seduction of the doctrine that God could thus be appeased by the "first fruits" of the body, are frightfully corroborated and illustrated by recent research in Palestine, especially that of Macalister at Gezer. The evidence there of the sacrifice of newborn children, probably the first-born, while belittled by some, will seem to most people satisfying and conclusive.

Realizing that Abraham lived in a land where was the constant pressure of example and the urgency of Canaanite neighbors that the first-born belonged to God and must be sacrificed to God, the dramatic revelation embodied in the scene on Mount Moriah is to us the one clear, bright light in that night of superstition and horrid cruelty. In one act and by one

word God imperatively called for the absolute surrender of the best, the "first-born," and at the same time sternly rebuked the notion that to slay it was such service.

Let no critic ask, Is such superstition as assailed Abraham compatible with such piety as is attributed to Abraham? at least not until the world has forgotten Salem witchcraft. Let no one say that such immorality as that to which Abraham seems undoubtedly to have assented in mind and purpose is incompatible with much religious knowledge or with high religious ideas; at least not until there has been blotted from memory the legal atrocities in England and on the Continent two centuries ago, and alas! the horrible lynchings which are a disgrace to America to this present time. A fair and beautiful body may have upon it somewhere a horrible ulcer. So a life of holiness and piety and a community of great attainment in divine things may yet bear some hideous remaining spots of the leprosy of sin.

VI. ISAAC

Less light is thrown upon the career of Isaac by archæological research than upon the career of any other of the patriarchs. Quite naturally so; for less is related of Isaac in the Bible than of the other patriarchs. So there are for us fewer points of contact between his history and that of the world about him. If more details of his life story were given us, we might find more illustrations from archæology bearing upon it. But the life he lived is quite in keeping with what is known of the land in which he dwelt. The so-called "doublets" pointed out by many critics, in which it

is claimed that there is a fictitious element in the patriarchal narrative, else such like events would not happen to different people or such similar methods be employed by father and son, can hardly appeal strongly to any but those who look in more upon the artificial world which the imagination creates than out upon the real world of human experience, and especially the Oriental world. Real life is full of doublets. Is it strange that real history and biography, not the fictitious life of mere legend, should also have in it some doublets? Since when, also, has it been discovered that sons did not walk in the footsteps of their fathers? And when did it come about that the harem practices of the East have not been a menace to homes and a threatening danger to any man who stood in the way of the gratification of the lustful desire of princes? Moreover, are we not to believe Herodotus because he tells the same story of different people whom he saw in his travels? So called "doublets" are far more numerous in this Greek historian than in the Pentateuch.

It must be said, albeit without bitterness or railing, that the mind that sets much store by any objection to the historicity of the patriarchal narratives because of the repetition of such harem tribulations among the people, is the mind of one who is primarily a critic, not an archæologist, one who has put the analytical method above the historical. Such processes of investigation must fail in the end, for at the last analysis facts will rule in conclusions.

CHAPTER XIX

The Tribal Period

I. THE DESCENT INTO EGYPT AND THE SOJOURN THERE

Patriarchal history has now come to the consummation of that event which gave rise to the prophecy of the Christ, "I have called my son out of Egypt." The actual descent into Egypt is marked at this point by the kidnapping of the young Bedouin prince, Joseph, to be spirited away to the Egyptian slave market. Archæology as yet sheds little light upon the critical wrangle about "Ishmaelites" and "Midianites"; and, since there is no other source of information on the subject, it is hard to take seriously the many speculations of critics about it and the striving on the part of some to show necessary discord in the narrative at this point. Especially is this the case since we know almost absolutely nothing of the tribal relations among Arabs east of the Jordan at that period, much less what manner of persons might be found in a caravan which has roved around, no one knows how long or in what directions or through what regions, to pick up trade for Egypt. Edomites are found on the border of Egypt in the time of Meremptah II according to the Papyrus Anastasia.[1] Why not, then, these southern Arabs, the Midianites, far enough north to enter the northern caravan trail toward Egypt? The Bedouin are wanderers. The philological speculations about these names are very interesting, but settle

nothing. When, through archæological research, we come to know something about the "Ishmaelites" and "Midianites" of that age, it will be time enough to found critical arguments upon this passage in the patriarchal narrative. As the case at present stands, many quibbles and some real questions can be raised here, but there is nothing inherently improbable in the story.

The Semitic influences in Egypt of the age just closing furnish the historical setting for Joseph's day. All those conditions which drew Abraham to Egypt mitigated the difficulties of Joseph's life, and those that made so natural the royal reception accorded to the first patriarch opened the way for his great-grandson to become Prime Minister. The history of kings' favorites in many lands and the trivialities of life upon which the favoritism ofttimes has turned is enough of itself to make the story of Joseph inherently credible. And since, within the consciousness of this present generation, a slave girl, the most helpless of all human beings, became the astute and powerful Empress and real ruler of China, the historical imagination need have no difficulty in fitting the young Bedouin slave prince into the premiership of Egypt of his day. The same line of Bedouin Princes was still on the throne as in the days of Abraham. The same bitter resentment toward the foreign intruders made native Egyptian courtiers untrustworthy at the court of Zoan. Those who wonder at the foreigner conducting so great business for the most exclusive nation of antiquity may learn something of the possibility of such a thing by consulting the diplomatic world, which for so many years transacted its business with the great Chinese

Empire, the most exclusive of modern great nations, through an Englishman.

Joseph's Egyptian name and the name of his Egyptian wife were inherently certain to cause critical trouble. The transliteration of the Egyptian language and the equivalency between Egyptian characters and the Hebrew letters is in such a state of hapless, it might also seem hopeless, uncertainty, that it is most natural that archæologists should find parallels to Joseph's name in different periods of Egyptian history. Dogmatically to declare, as it is declared by many,[1] that no such name as Zaphnath-paaneah is found in Egyptian history until about the IXth century B.C., is to claim as a certainty what is no more than a possibility, if even that. There are Egyptian names of that period which afford a fair equivalent for the Hebrew form Zaphnath-paaneah.[2] There are also other identifications of the name at different periods of Egyptian history. They are all in some good degree plausible; but this so *varied* plausibility certainly does not make certainty at any point. It rather militates against it, though not rendering it impossible. But, in fact, the identification of Joseph's name among Egyptian names which meets the fewest difficulties and accords most exactly with the narrative in the Bible is illustrated by certain royal names from the time just preceding the days of Joseph. "Zaph" is the significant, as well as troublesome, part of Joseph's name, the rest of it is descriptive and very simple in the Egyptian. These royal names of the time of Joseph are also compounded with this word "Zaph." The phonetic equivalency is most exact and the meaning

of the whole name becomes most appropriate. "The one who furnishes the nourishment of life," *i.e.*, the "Steward of the realm."[1]

The name Asenath really affords no difficulty, though there has been some discussion about it. Good illustrations of this name may be found all the way from the XIth dynasty to the XVIIIth dynasty long before, and long after, the age in which the Bible places the story of Joseph.

The court scandal which, in the strange providence of God, was at the turning point in the career of Joseph is a most natural affair in—let us say the Orient, to be polite. To discredit this story as an independent narrative because of the nasty Tale of Two Brothers found in Egyptian history some four centuries later seems a most remarkable caprice of criticism. Is it so impossible to imagine that in the whole history of Egypt there was more than one court scandal? Or are these same critics so ethereal in their passions as not to know that the essential elements of such scandals are the same everywhere and always? Any special coarseness, or seeming refinement, is in the telling of the story. Some one is unfaithful to the demands of chastity, there is seduction from one side or the other. These constitute the framework of scandal, and lust supplies all the rest. Differences between different stories are chiefly the work of the narrator. Why then should this Tale of Two Brothers in the time of Rameses II be asserted to be the original of the story of Joseph? Are we to understand that, because practically every scandal of French fiction involves an unfaithful wife or a woman of the *demi monde*, that therefore there

was no real Madame Pompadour? Let us rather recognize that the dangers of the Oriental home life always make reasonable just such an episode in the life of a manservant about the house. And let us also recognize as entirely reasonable that every Egyptian court in every age of Egyptian history could afford at least one court scandal. When we have done this, the utter unreliability of the identification of the story of Joseph with the disgusting Tale of Two Brothers will at once be apparent. It is difficult not to wonder sometimes whether or not those who talk so confidently about these Egyptian romances of salacious character ever really read the whole of that smutty story of Two Brothers, and especially if they know enough of the Egyptian tongue to perceive the real stench of it.

Archæological evidence, which thus far in the career of Joseph has, for the most part, only cleared difficulties out of the way, now becomes more positive concerning the great work of Joseph the Prime Minister. In the tomb of one Baba at el-Kab, now unfortunately much mutilated, is an inscription of the time of Se-Kenen-Ra-Taa III, a vassal king of Upper Egypt under the Hyksos rulers. Exact dates are here impossible, but the time of this king and of this inscription is known to be about the time of Apophis, the traditional Pharaoh of Joseph according to Syncellus. Thus far none of the identifications between the story of Baba and the history of Joseph are absolutely certain, but when we read the inscription as it appeared in Brugsch's[1] day, the parallelism of the two accounts of certain events in the empire becomes most suggestive. Baba says "I collected corn, as a friend of the harvest god. I

was watchful at the time of the sowing. And when a famine arose, lasting many years, I distributed corn to the city each year of famine."

The coincidences between this narrative and that of the famine recorded in the Bible in the story of Joseph are most striking. Great famines in Egypt are most rare and the details of this narrative of Baba follow very closely the details of the famine story of the days of Joseph. There were years of plenty when grain could be stored up, government provision for storing it, a great famine "lasting many years," distribution of aid to the starving people from the government storehouses, and the final success of the comprehensive plan of the government, which extended its beneficence from the Capital at the city of Zoan far into Upper Egypt; and all this took place during Hyksos rule at the period to which the Bible account assigns the premiership of Joseph. The substantiation of the credibility of the Biblical narrative is complete, and the corroboration of the actuality of the events narrated in the story of Joseph becomes very strong.

The history of the commercial dealings of Jacob and his sons with Egypt and the final descent of the families to the land of the Nile, which was ultimately to be to them the land of bondage, fits likewise exactly into the general conditions of life there in that age and receives some remarkable historical verifications of an incidental character, a few of which are now to be cited.

The coming of Asiatics into Egypt before the time of Jacob is pictured in the tomb of Khnem-Hotep of the XIIth dynasty at Beni Hasan.[1] The similarity

of this scene to the entrance of Jacob and his sons with their retinue into Egypt is so strikingly exact that for a long time in the earlier history of Egyptology this was believed to picture that patriarchal event.

The Israelites were assigned to the pasture-land of Goshen. Thus, as the favorites of the king's Prime Minister, they were given a place of safety near the court in that part of Egypt most fully occupied by the Hyksos. Their isolation from the more strictly Egyptian communities because "every shepherd is abomination to the Egyptians" finds most striking confirmation in the epithet "aat,"[1] the equivalent of the "abomination" in the Bible, by which these foreign shepherd kings were known among the Egyptians. So sedulously do they adhere to this contemptuous epithet in the inscriptions that, to this day, the ethnic name of this dynasty of foreign rulers has not been discovered. The meaning of the name Hyksos, "Bedouin Princes," gives no clue to racial identity. The name Hyksos itself we learn through Josephus quoting Manetho.[2]

Several Yaqob scarabs[3] have been found among Egyptian relics. It would be sheer assumption, without any evidence whatever, to assert that these were made to commemorate the patriarch. Yet it is not impossible, nor even improbable, that it may have been so. Scarabs contain only very important names. Considering that the patriarch was held in high favor at the Hyksos court and that some Semite of the name Yaqob in that age was of such importance as to be commemorated on scarabs, the coincidence is striking, and does, without doubt, substantiate the great importance of Semites at that time in that part of Egypt.

That some of the tribe of Asher, and possibly of Ephraim, may have returned to Palestine in the days of favor at court or have escaped after the days of oppression began, as seems to be indicated in Judges and by the Chronicler,[1] is so inherently reasonable and natural that it furnishes no ground for critical argument either for or against the Biblical story. Days of freedom and favor always are days of the liberty of movement. And when has it ever been that slaves did not succeed in running away?

The obsequies for Jacob,[2] the embalming, the seventy days of mourning, the imposing funeral cortege, and the important place in national affairs of Egypt accorded to all the funeral ceremonies, are just what is to be expected, if the narrative in the Bible is strictly historical.

Let us summarize. This whole history of the descent into Egypt is most essentially reasonable and credible. Undoubted identifications confirm the topographic and ethnic notices in the patriarchal story; Egyptian descriptions substantiate the manners and customs depicted in the Bible; Egyptian scarabs confirm even the very name "Jacob" for that period in Egypt; Egyptian history furnishes a similar famine story; and attests the "abomination" in which "shepherds" were held; and the Egyptian funeral customs most exactly illustrate the funeral and the mourning for Jacob. This part of the patriarchal story fits, in every way, exactly into the age and the lands to which the Bible attributes it. It is readily to be admitted that difficulties can be pointed out, that archæological facts may be so marshalled as to make seeming discrepancies, though

no absolute contradictions. There are, in fact, inexplicable discrepancies in all human history. Events which take place under our very eyes are ofttimes inexplicable and seemingly contradictory. That such like difficulties exist in the Bible proves nothing against the Scripture narrative. The proper question of veracity in taking of testimony is not, Is there any way to make the witness out a liar? but, Is there any natural and reasonable way in which his statements may be true? The statements of the patriarchal history are easily consistent with every demand of veracity.

II. HEBREW SLAVERY IN EGYPT

The next event in Bible history, the coming of "the king that knew not Joseph," may well be said to mark the next epoch in Egyptian history, Who was the "king that knew not Joseph?" We know not, and because of the characteristic silence of the Egyptians upon all things connected with the Hyksos rule, we probably will never know. But we may be well assured that it was at a change of dynasties, and such a change as saw the hated foreigners forever dethroned and the old native princes of Egypt coming again into their own. Then the favorites of the kings, the petted and the hated, a part of the "abomination," must certainly be brought down with the fall of their protectors. The expulsion of the Hyksos, the restoration of the native Egyptian government, and the enslavement of the Hebrews follow each other with the utmost naturalness. It is impossible to determine which was the particular king who began the oppression. The conflict with the Hebrews was a long and bitter one. It

is highly improbable that the native government would at first feel strong enough in its revived spirit of nationalism to make complete degradation of the favorites of the old regime immediately. Perhaps, as is thought by many, it was not until the beginning of the XIXth[1] dynasty that the king arose who dared wholly to set at defiance the people of the great Prime Minister who had saved Egypt.

The recent discovery of the tomb of Tut-ankh-Amen sheds a possible light upon the "Pharaoh that knew not Joseph." Tut-Ankh-Amen returned from the house of his father-in-law, Akhenaten, to the religion of the priests of Amen. This religious movement let loose the pent up hatred of the people toward the Asiatic religion of Akhenaten. But Israel's religion was also Asiatic and would naturally be included in hatred of the Egyptians. This may have been the starting point of the persecution of Israel.

Whoever may have been the "Pharaoh that knew not Joseph," Rameses II was the great oppressor. He began to fear the increasing numbers of the Hebrews, even though slaves; and took cruel and desperate measures to make them characteristically a race of women, that thus the danger of revolt might be lessened or even entirely averted. It is frankly admitted that there are many difficulties to be encountered in the identification of the oppressor. There are questions which can not be satisfactorily answered, no matter who is selected as the oppressor. Many plausible things can be said in favor of Thothmes III or some one of the great monarchs of the XVIIIth dynasty. It is not possible to clear away all the difficulties in the

way of identifying Rameses II as the oppressor, nor is it by possible or plausible arguments that we are to arrive at a conclusion upon this subject, but by giving heed to the things that are necessary and imperative. The Bible says that Israel built Pithom. Rameses II left an inscription there upon which he says[2] that he built Pithom at "the mouth of the East."

That the Pithom of both statements is the same is undisputed. Despite Rameses' well-known propensity for the worst plagiarism in usurping the inscriptions of his predecessors, the genuineness of this inscription has not a shadow upon it.

There have been no erasures or insertions, and there is not the slightest evidence that any other Pharaoh built at Pithom, though there may have been a town there before the government gave the place national importance by making it a frontier fortress and base of supplies. Here, then, whatever may be plausibly said for any other king or any other time for the oppression, whatever difficulties are encountered in the case of Rameses II as the oppressor (and difficulties are inevitable at every point in the fragmentary history of Egypt from the monuments), the two undisputable facts, as they at present appear in the discussion of this question, are that Israel built Pithom and that Rameses built Pithom. It is worse than disputatiousness to ignore these facts and to draw back from the inevitable conclusion that Rameses was the oppressor, or to try to create a diversion by presenting other candidates for that infamy. We must not blink our eyes to the presence of a clear light in the night because there is a vast space of darkness surrounding it.

A recent discovery at Beisan in Palestine by the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania has added a startling, and most illuminating, confirmation of the evidence for Rameses II as the oppressor. A stele of Rameses II was found in the ruins at Beisan which recounts, among other works of that Pharaoh, that he built Ramases in Egypt, and adds the most instructive additional fact that he did the work with Semitic Asiatic slaves. As Ramases was the other store city which the Israelites built, the evidence for Rameses as the real builder, and not merely rebuilder, of Pithom, and in consequence for Rameses as the oppressor, becomes overwhelming.[1]

The place of the Exodus in Egyptian history, indicated by the identification of Rameses II as the oppressor and the builder of the Store Cities, received confirmation by certain correspondences backward and forward with both Egyptian and Biblical history which, indeed, establish that identification beyond reasonable question. Those who have been saying that "there is not a particle of real evidence for the Exodus at the end of the reign of Rameses II" will do well to ponder the following facts.

No matter at what point in Egyptian history the Exodus be placed there are insuperable difficulties, i.e., insuperable in our present knowledge of the facts in detail for that period. Notwithstanding this, there are certain pieces of evidence that are decisive, certain hinges upon which the case turns. Once these hinges are discovered and employed the case really turns upon them, however much creaking it may make in doing so. There is the well-known tablet of 400 years

discovered by Mariette many years ago. It is a tablet which was set up by Rameses II in memory of his father Seti I, (Some think in honor of the god Set). The inscription upon this tablet is not of much consequence for the most part. Perhaps the most important thing in it is the dating. It is strangely dated with an epochal date contrary to the usual synchronistic, or Sed-festival, method of dating. The tablet was erected in "the 400th year of king Nubti." This Pharaoh was one of the Hyksos kings whose exact place in Egyptian history is in dispute. But that he ruled about the time of Apophis, the Pharaoh of Joseph, is admitted by all. It is generally thought that he immediately succeeded Apophis. Now the prophecy of 400 years (Gen. xv; 13) makes it 400 years from Joseph to Moses, stated as exactly 430 years (Exodus xii, 41). The tablet of 400 years makes it 400 years from Nubti in the age of Joseph to Rameses II. Here is the "deadly parallel" that cannot be escaped. Rameses II and Moses must have been cotemporaries.

This correspondence with Egyptian history backward is quite balanced by another correspondence forward. The Bible represents in the books of Joshua, Judges, and I and II Samuel, that the Israelites were allowed to hold Palestine, "the bridge of nations," the great avenue between the continents, for about five hundred years undisturbed by the great nations of Asia and Africa. There are many notices of conflict with the petty nations round about, the Philistines, the Ammonites, the Moabites and the Syrians, but not a word of invasion, or oppression, by either Egypt or Assyria-Babylonia.

Now, if the Exodus took place in the time of the eighteenth Egyptian Dynasty, the only other time suggested for that event, then we have the great Pharaohs of the nineteenth Dynasty, Seti I, and Rameses II, making expedition after expedition to Palestine, ravaging and ransacking the whole land, literally combing it again and again, and bringing back great quantities of rich booty, detailed description of which they have left on their Monuments (Müller Archaelogical Researches, 1906). That all these things happened while the Israelites were in the land, and yet not one word about them got into the story of the Israelites who dwelt at the very places pillaged, is not merely improbable, it is ludicrously incredible.

On the other hand, turning to Egyptian and Assyro-Babylonian history, we find that it exactly agrees with the representations of the Bible. Beginning with Meremptah, the successor of Rameses II, Egyptian history went down, down, down, for five hundred years until Shishak came down from Ethiopia, occupied the Egyptian throne, and went up and robbed the temple at Jerusalem in the days of Rehoboam. A few attempts to invade Palestine were made by Meremptah and Rameses III, but they were confined to the Maritime Plains, not at that time occupied by the Israelites; and so no account of these incursions is to be expected in the Bible.

Turning to the east, we find that at the time of the Conquest the old Babylonian empire had fallen, and its successor, Assyria, took five hundred years to grow great and start upon her ravaging tour of world

conquest. Here again is exactly the five hundred year period demanded by Biblical history for Israel to grow great undisturbed by the great nations on the east and on the south; *and it is the only such period anywhere in history.*

It is not reasonable to expect that Egypt will ever furnish more than incidental information concerning Hebrew slavery. Thus far, at least, nearly all the knowledge we have concerning Egypt from Egypt is monumental, of the usual boastful character of monumental inscriptions among all nations. These inscriptions are supplemented in Egypt by a few historical papyri, some of which are also clearly of a laudatory character, the historical value of which must be carefully determined. Moreover, the slave is a very humble man, and ancient Egypt was one of the proudest and most exclusive of nations. Is it likely that such a story as the Bible tells of Israel's relations with Egypt will find a place in Egyptian literature of such character as that which we possess? So, whatever the future may have in store for us, and in archæology it is usually the unexpected that happens, the past, at least, is not disappointing to us nor discrediting to the Bible story in that little of a positive character has been found of that part of Egyptian history which is recorded in Genesis and Exodus. But if there is little information of a direct and positive kind, there is much of an incidental and inferential character at the period indicated by the entirely incidental synchronism of Israel with Rameses II at the building of Pithom.

Ebers, who was as learned in Egyptology as he was talented in fiction, in his Egyptian romance of *Uarda* represents Hebrew slavery as ever hovering about, like

the trembling bondman, in the shadows. The Hebrew never comes out plainly into view in the story, but one is conscious that he is waiting near at hand, ready to serve. The art of the romancer has here rightly represented the sober everyday life of Egyptian history at that period. Many Semitic words are found in the Egyptian language of that time, words which exactly illustrate conditions represented in the Bible. We are told of "Succoth," shepherds' booths, and "ohel," a more permanent tabernacle or tent used by soldiers in camp. Then the Hebrew word for "master" crept into Egyptian official reports in place of the common Egyptian title meaning "superintendent of constructions," exactly as the negro slave word "massa" was taken up into American English of slavery days, but has now almost wholly past out of use and will soon be entirely obsolete.[1]

Meremptah's administration in its early days was much troubled by foreigners in the land, and the many Semitic words used in connection with their movements indicate that they were probably Semites. While his reign opened with the presence of such troublesome Semitic populations, strange to say, very shortly after he came to the throne, Goshen, in the delta, near the capital at Tanis, for some reason not mentioned, furnished an attraction to Bedouin shepherds[2] of the desert who sent a request to be permitted to enter that region to pasture their flocks. Bedouin are wild, free-roving, fellows who do not like to be cramped for room. They must have thought there was then room to spare in Goshen, and the time was exactly that at which the Bible represents Goshen to have been deserted by the Israelites with their flocks and herds.

III. MOSES

Does Egypt tell us anything of Moses? Nothing that is certain, definite, and positive. The Bible account laid alongside of the Egyptian history of Rameses II as the great oppressor gives us an attractive picture of the young Hebrew, the "son of Pharaoh's daughter," growing up among the princes of Pharaoh's house. Jewish and Arabic tradition[1] surround this period with a multitude of legends which do not for the most part comment themselves as embodying reliable history. Egyptian records tell us nothing that is indisputable, but give us one very curious and suggestive incident, which, if it does not concern Moses, at least gives us a picture that so resembles Moses as to make us think of him, a picture of one just such as he at the Egyptian court at the very time when Moses was growing up there. It is recorded that among the princes and nobles present at a great public function was "The Ramoses, child of the Lady and Priestess of the sun-god Ra.[2]" That Moses would have the name of an Egyptian god appended to his name while the "son of Pharaoh's daughter" is practically a certainty, the practice was so general. But more even than the name itself, the definite article prefixed to the name, "the Ramoses;" and his remarkable designation as "child of the Lady," not using the word for "son" nor yet the ordinary word for child, but a word affording a pun on the name "Moses" and meaning "the drawn-out one"; and, above all, the description of this child not as the child of his father or even the child of his mother, but as "the child of the Lady and Priestess,"—all not only indicate a striking resemblance

to the story of Moses in Bible history, but plainly show a labored effort on the part of the scribe to describe an unusual situation. No Egyptologist would be justified in saying that this Ramoses is Moses; it is not probable, yet it is possible. In any case, this incident falls into its place among the many other indications which make entirely reasonable and credible the Bible story of Israelite slavery and of a friend of the oppressed people, with the family name of the royal house, growing up at that time in the Court of Tanis.

If the story of Moses and of Hebrew slavery in Egypt in all its details is true, it will fit naturally and without difficulty into the Egyptian history of that period. It does so. It is not necessary in order to give credibility to the story that further proof should be furnished. Does not, indeed, the proof thus furnished go still further? Does mere romantic legend ever find such natural setting and a place of such fitness in real history?

It seems almost superfluous to add that, in the presence of such perfection of historical conditions for the Biblical story in Egypt, the theory of the "desert Egypt" below the southern boundary of Palestine, without a vestige of such historical conditions to sustain it, is not worthy of serious consideration. The most beautiful and attractive theory in the world without any facts, either of the necessary actualities or of the equally necessary conditions for the actualities, is as worthless as any other most charming daydream.

CHAPTER XX

The Tribal Period—Continued

IV. THE EXODUS

The location of Sinai and the journey thither is the next portion of Bible history alongside of which archæological research may be expected to lay parallel information. Let it be said frankly that no one point in this whole journey of the Exodus can be positively identified alone by evidence independent of any consideration of other points. It is not necessary that places should be so identified nor would such identification possess any peculiar advantage as evidence, if it could be done. Isolated identifications may be correct, but are peculiarly liable to be mistaken identifications. The most convincing evidence for any narrative of a route of travel is that which shows each point in the journey in its proper relation to those on either side of it, and which does not leave over any facts or incidents of the journey for which no place can be provided. The description of a route which so meets all the conditions and attests them by surrounding facts, must certainly be accepted unhesitatingly by any military strategist as the correct account of the movements of an enemy. Exactly such is the attestation of the route taken by the fleeing Israelites as recorded in the Bible and traced out in Palmer's *Route of the Exodus*. This is the same route that is laid down in nearly all Geographical Helps published by

the great Bible publishers of the world. It is easy enough for any one sitting in his study at a distance of seven thousand miles from the scene of the events to point out many difficulties in this identification of the route. An actual journey over it, however, day by day, station by station, while reading the narrative and studying the description of conditions and topography on to the end in the heart of the Sinai region is an experience on the subject well-nigh irresistible.

The northeast route by the "way of the Philistines" was the shortest and most direct route to the promised land, but it would be well-guarded. Pithom itself was built at the "mouth of the East," a part of the great frontier defenses in that direction; and the "wall," another of the military defenses of Egypt which guarded this way of entrance by Asiatic invaders, was always at this period of Egyptian history well garrisoned, as is indicated in the inscriptions. Then the Philistines occupied the southwestern corner of the Promised Land and they were famed warriors. So the Israelites turned about by the way of "the wilderness of the Red Sea." This route was less guarded; for Eastern invaders never came this way.

So the fleeing host of Israel moved out to encamp "before Pi-hahiroth between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal Zephon." The topographical situation thus described in the narrative is so remarkably verified where Ras Atakeh comes down to the sea and *nowhere else*, that the crossing must have been near that point. There, at the southern end of the Egyptian land frontier on the east, is a most natural situation for a "Migdol," a watch-tower, and a suitable plain for the encampment

lies between it and the sea. The mountain peak pointed out, though not certainly identified, as Baal Zephon is "over against," on the east side of the sea. The pursuing Egyptian army thrown across the narrow space between the range of Atakeh and the sea would effectually cut off any hope of retreat for the Israelites. Verily, "the wilderness had shut them in."

The flat sand-bar which characterizes the whole upper end of this little arm of the Red Sea, by reason of both its character and its position, is specially exposed to the influence of wind and tide. As the tide went out, the waters would go back "before an east wind" in a remarkable way, leaving bare a wide strip of the sand-bar over which the whole host of Israel could pass quickly. At the same time, the waters on either side would be "as a wall"[1] of protection from approach on either flank. The Egyptians coming up in the darkness would not be able to tell where was the shore line. Indeed, it is difficult for any one at any time to tell just where the shore line is here. Thus the pursuers followed blindly on the trail of the fugitives beyond the line of safety. The wind abated and the tide of the sea came on in its strength. Though nothing is said explicitly of the tide it is involved in the time represented to have passed from the evening to the after half of the night, as there is a turn of the tide every six hours. The infiltration gave the first warning, as it clogged their chariot wheels so that "they drave them heavily"[2] on the sandy beach now turned to a quicksand underneath by the incoming waters. Too late, they discovered that they were beyond the shore line and tried to escape by retreat, but the waters, released

from the pressure of the wind, rushed in full tide to overwhelm them. This whole narrative is most reasonable, unless one be willing arbitrarily to deny the miraculous timing of natural agencies with divine commands.

From this point to the heart of the Sinai peninsula the route described follows, stage by stage, the route marked out by nature and followed by caravan travel from time immemorial. The exact distances, the precise topography, all the local coloring appears as one goes along. That it is found to be so is the last link in the chain of evidence for the place for the crossing. If it were located much farther north, the first journey of "three days" would be impossible. The description in the Bible is most exact. Some travelers, preparing for this same trip, inquired about a guidebook. The answer was, "Take your Bible. It is the best." And it was. Baedaker has never issued a guidebook that is so graphic as is the book of Exodus for this journey.

V. THE TABERNACLE IN THE WILDERNESS

"See thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount." So God instructed Moses. So always the architect instructs the builder. This instruction implies neither anything new nor anything old in the plan. It merely directs the builder which plan, out of all possible or feasible plans, he is to follow in the building. The plan itself, in this case, can be learned only from the building erected, as we have it described in Exodus. It was an Egyptian building. The main features of its architecture are the main and unvarying features of Egyptian architecture in the

humble home of the peasant, in the palace of the prince, in the tomb, the home of the dead, and in the temple, the home of the gods. There was here in the tabernacle, as everywhere in Egypt, the outer court, the inner assembly room, and the private apartment.

The furnishing of the tabernacle and its symbolism, also, in part at least, reflect Egyptian ideas and coloring. The ark is very like the sacred box of the Egyptians. The mysterious cherubim, as they are not clearly understood, cannot be clearly identified; but there is very suggestive Egyptian symbolism which they much resemble. The overshadowing of wings is markedly Egyptian, though the Babylonians had already adopted it, and later it entered into the Bible as one of the most beautiful figures of speech in the language of psalmists and prophets and of the Lord himself.

These architectural forms, these natural types and symbols, are God's own. That idolatrous Egyptians used them did not make them theirs nor deprive God of the right to use his own. So that, stripped of all idolatrous significance, they were adapted and adopted for the revelation of divine truth.[1]

These things are true of the architecture and symbolism of the tabernacle no *matter when the Pentateuch was written.* But the structure and furnishing of the tabernacle fit best into the Mosaic age, where the narrative of the Bible places them. The theory which makes the tabernacle in the wilderness a mere projection from later times upon the wilderness life as upon a screen, meets with difficulties which its advocates have never removed or satisfactorily explained. If a late priestly writer devised the tabernacle upon the

model of the temple at Jerusalem, how does it come that, in that age, this temple model was in so many essential parts distinctly Egyptian? That Phœnician elements entered into it is quite natural, considering the relation which existed between Solomon and Hiram king of Tyre. But these Phœnician elements are not found in the tabernacle. The explanation of the unique wing symbolism of the temple and the tabernacle by Babylonian and Assyrian symbolism is a foreshortening of the view that does not commend the scholarly character of it; for every Egyptologist knows, and every Assyriologist ought to know, that the overshadowing of wings so prominent in Babylonian and Assyrian sculpture is only a rather clumsy adaptation of Egyptian symbolism. It is impossible to give any satisfactory reason why Solomon should have made the temple so peculiarly Egyptian, except the simple and manifest explanation plainly intended by the narrative in the Bible, that he fashioned it after the tabernacle. Any explanation which rests upon supposed cordiality between Israel and Egypt evinced by the marriage of Solomon with an Egyptian princess limps very badly. Oriental marriages have nothing to do with sentiment, but are entirely for convenience, which in international affairs means diplomacy. Considering the frequency with which wars were terminated by the immolation of some helpless princess on the marriage altar as the wife of the royal enemy, it is far more to be suspected that this Egyptian Princess was a diplomatic agent for preserving peace; that is to say, in unvarnished English, a hostage from her father and a spy upon her husband. A careful study of the

history at this juncture of affairs will make plain also that the marrying of this princess was the way by which Solomon got Gezer fully and finally; and thus completed his empire in that quarter; and secured the withdrawal of the finger Egypt had always kept upon this little spot from the time of the entrance of Israel into the land.[1]

No such difficulties as these are encountered by the view that sees in the account of the tabernacle a simple narrative of facts in the days of Moses when all the mental furniture of Israelite thought was of Egyptian make. Egyptian forms and symbolism were more understood by them than any other that might have been chosen. Thus this view of the history of the tabernacle agrees naturally and completely with the archæological evidence.

VI. THE TURNING BACK AT KADESH BARNEA

Finally, in this part of the Bible history, the turning back of Israel from Kadesh Barnea to wander in the wilderness fits entirely into the requirement of the boastful inscription[2] of Meremptah II, and agrees with the one chronological note there given. That inscription is dated in the fifth year of Meremptah II, and declares the "the Israelties are defeated, their seed is destroyed." At the death of Rameses II, the king who sought Moses' life, and at the accession of Meremptah II, Moses is sent to Egypt. If one year be allowed for the preparation and the return, and one year for the plagues, as their character seems to require,[3] and two years for the journey from Egypt to Kadesh Barnea, then this failure of Israel to enter

Canaan and the disappearnace in the wilderness would be in Meremptah's fifth year. His boast would be a most natural one. Remembering the cruel efforts made to destroy the equilibrium of the sexes in Israel and to make the Israelites characteristically a nation of women, it was very easy for the Pharoah to make, perhaps even to believe, the specious claim that the final victory was with Egypt in the failure of Israel to enter the promised land, and to indulge in the sarcastic gibe that "Khar [Palestine] is become as the widows of Egypt,"[1] because deprived of Israel. Thus far Biblical history falls in most naturally and simply with the results of archæological research.

VII. THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION

We have now come to that point upon which everything finally turns. Does the history of literature among Hebrew people begin as early as this period? If this question be answered in the affirmative, then there will at once arise the still more crucial question, Are there any purely archæological indications that the Pentateuch did come from this Mosaic age?

That the age of Moses was a literary age not only in Egypt and Babylonia, but also in Palestine, is a settled question. The abundant Egyptian literature, with inscriptions from even the desert of Sinai, and the large remaining collection of Tell Amarna tablets must, from the very nature of things, be but fragmentary illustrations of such a widespread literary culture as makes ample literary room and preparation for the Pentateuch and for the production of a much larger general literature, which is probably forever lost. So

it is admitted by all classes of critics that the patriarchs could have written, that the mere literary requirements of the Pentateuch might have been met in the Mosaic age. Whether this was possible in their own tongue and by a script peculiar to themselves is still a mooted question, but its answer one way or the other does not essentially affect the main question. If Palestinian people one hundred and fifty years before the Exodus could write letters to Egypt by means of a Babylonian script,[1] there is no necessity that the Hebrews should have their own script in order to write the Pentateuch, when they had just come out of Egypt.

So the form of the question today is not, Could the patriarchs have written? but, Did they write? not, Could Moses have produced a Pentateuch? but, Did some one in the Mosaic age produce the Pentateuch which we now have? There are certain archæological indications that the Pentateuch substantially as we have it today, in its parts and as a whole, did come from the Mosaic age.

The historical notice of the land of Rameses in the account[2] of the arrival of Jacob and the families of Israel in Egypt furnishes archæological evidence of peculiar value because of its incidental character. One of the historians of the early period of American discovery says of an explorer that he searched the north Atlantic coast as far down as Hartford. On the other hand, it is very common in early colonial history to call New York New Amsterdam. In neither case is any explanation by the historian needed. He may use either the name by which the place was known at the time *of* which he writes, or at the time *at* which

he writes without any explanation. Habits of human thought create a mutual understanding, a kind of compact of intelligibility, which allows this liberty. But, if he give the place some other name, he must explain himself, must locate himself and his readers, or the compact of intelligibility between them would be violated and his work would be nonsense. Any historian who should write in these days of a city on Manhattan Island in the early times and call it neither New Amsterdam nor New York, but some fanciful name without any explanation, would make himself ridiculous. In fact it is never so done. Now the author of Genesis says: "And Joseph placed his father and his brethren and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses, as Pharaoh had commanded." He calls the land "Rameses" without any explanation. If he used the name of the land at the time of which he wrote, or at the time at which he wrote, no explanation was needed for the readers; otherwise he must have explained himself. He did not explain himself. Did he then use the name of the place at the time at which he wrote, or at the time of which he wrote; or was the time of which he wrote the time at which he wrote? Only two answers have arisen to contest the place for acceptance: One that the author was Moses or some other person at the time of the Exodus; the other that he was a scribe at the time of Hezekiah, or of Josiah, or of the exile, nine, ten, eleven centuries after the time of which he wrote.[1] This latter view meets insuperable obstacles. A scribe of that late date, if he were the author of this passage, did not call the place by its name at the time at which

he wrote, for the name had passed out of Egyptian history centuries before. The City of Rameses, from the neighborhood of which the children of Israel set out, perished. The Ramesside dynasty, which gave its name to so many things and places during its time, also passed away; and many other dynasties had succeeded in order before the days of this scribe of the VIIth or Vth century B.C. Moreover, the "land of Rameses" was never a general name for Egypt, but only a local name for a small district in the neighborhood to which Israel was assigned, and that only for a limited time. As the scribe did not call this place by its name at the time at which he wrote, so neither did he call it by its name at the time of which he wrote. Rameses was not an Egyptian name in the days of the Hyksos king under whom Joseph lived nor for nearly four hundred years afterwards. Thus the scribe would have called the place by a name which was not its name at the time at which he wrote nor at the time of which he wrote, but by some other name, without explanation, and thus have made his writing nonsense. Moreover, if this scribe did use neither the name of the place at the time at which he wrote, nor at the time of which he wrote, but some other; *i.e.*, Rameses, how did he know that name? Was he an expert Egyptologist? Did he so many centuries after the Ramesside dynasty was at an end and the whilom name of this little district forgotten in Egypt, search out the buried and forgotten history of that age and recover this name there? And if he did so, on what principle did he choose this particular name? If it may be supposed that he simply gave it a name from

the well-known names of Egypt, did Providence direct the rascal to select a name which turned out to be the exact name of a petty district in that neighborhood and that the very one in which Israel lived and at the very time at which they took their departure? From all these absurdities, how refreshing it is to turn to the Mosaic authorship at the time of the Exodus, when the "land of Rameses" was an intelligible expression for the region round about the Store City from which Israel set out, and to find the author calling the place in which they located Joseph's father and brethren by the familiar name by which it was known at the time at which he wrote, just as the historian said: "The early explorer searched the north-Atlantic coast as far down as Hartford."

The obscurity of the doctrine of the resurrection in the Pentateuch has also an important bearing upon the question of the time of authorship. The argument from silence is here in a very peculiar form. As it is strongly urged at this point against the authorship of the Pentateuch in the Mosaic age, its use in favor of it will need no justification. In fact, the comparative silence of the Pentateuch on this great doctrine of the resurrection exists and must be accounted for. Remembering the popular belief at the present time concerning the doctrine of the resurrection among the Egyptians of that age, the objection raised against the Mosaic authorship because of the obscurity of the doctrine in the Pentateuch is the most real and reasonable objection that has been presented. How could the Pentateuch, composed at that time, leave in such obscurity the doctrine of the resurrection among a

people just come out of Egypt? It is not to be overlooked that the advocates of a late authorship for the Pentateuch have the same problem of accounting for this silence. Considering the utterances of the Psalmist,[1] of Job,[2] of Isaiah,[3] of Exekiel,[4] and of Daniel,[5] in the period in which they claim the Pentateuch was being produced, their problem is scarcely less troublesome. They may be left to wrestle with their own difficulties, with only this admonition that they can never justly claim to have "assured results" until they have satisfactorily solved this problem.

There is a most satisfactory solution of the problem in the Mosaic age. The so-called doctrine of the resurrection among the ancient Egyptians down to the time of the departure of Israel, was not a doctrine of resurrection at all, but a doctrine of resuscitation.[6] It never progressed beyond this until later times, and did not rise to be a real doctrine of resurrection until the light of Christian doctrine shone round about. The ancient Egyptians had no conception of the Biblical doctrine of the resurrection, that doctrine which shines out ever more and more clearly until we have the words of Paul, which have fixed from that time to this the Christian conception of resurrection: "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body." The Egyptian doctrine in that age of the Exodus was grossly materialistic. True, there was always something ghostly in their conception of life after death, yet there was always the most confident expectation of coming forth again from the tomb to the same old life of sensual enjoyment, feeding upon "oxen, geese,

bread, beer, wine, and all good things." Even while the body lay in the tomb these things were supplied in the greatest abundance for the use of the dead man.[2]

Could such a doctrine of the rising from the dead be used as a starting point for the Biblical doctrine of the resurrection? Could any approach be made to the Biblical doctrine until first the people learned spiritual conceptions of God, of worship, and of the other world? Any mention of the rising from the dead to a people just come out of Egypt at that time would inevitably and necessarily have carried over into Israel's religion all the materialistic conceptions of the Egyptian doctrine of resuscitation. The only way to avoid this was to avoid any mention of the subject until such time as Israel had been weaned away from the Egyptian doctrine and had attained to some good degree of spiritual conceptions.

Thus, Israel's knowledge of the Egyptian idea of the resurrection, so far from being a reason for the presence of the doctrine in the Pentateuch, if written at that time, is a good and very sufficient reason for the obscurity in which that doctrine is left. And the Mosaic age becomes the only time in the history of Israel from the Exodus to the Exile and the return to Palestine, when the obscurity of this doctrine in the Pentateuch is entirely explicable. By reason of this result of the process of exclusion, the argument from silence in this case reasons very strongly for the Mosaic age as the time of the authorship of the Pentateuch. That there is progress of doctrine in revelation and that last things are properly put last is true, and will account for the full revelation of the doctrine of the resurrection

coming only in apostolic times, but will not account for the almost entire absence of even incidental reference to this doctrine in the Pentateuchal part of revelation, if it is to be put far down the course after the psalmists and the prophets were already keeping the doctrine before the minds of the people.

The striking presentation of the doctrine of the future life in the dramatic poetry of Job in the reference to Egyptian mythology concerning behemoth and leviathan was probably intended at one and the same time to give assurance of immortality and to strike at the Egyptian doctrine of the future life.

Another archæological indication concerning the date of the authorship of the Pentateuch is found in the presence and peculiar use of certain Egyptain words scattered all through the various parts of the Pentateuch. These words are of such unusual meaning and of such temporary use in Egypt, belong so peculiarly to the place and the times and are used with such absolute accuracy throughout the Pentateuch, that it is incredible that scribes of a late period in Israel's history could have attained to such a linguistic nicety. The passages in which these words occur must have come from the Mosaic age, the only age when some of them were employed in Egypt. The presentation of this evidence would of itself make a volume. Some of it has already been given.[1] The remainder must be seen by consulting the references. Moreover, the passages in which these words occur are so distributed through the Pentateuch, are so woven into the very fibre of it, and are so essential to the context, that they extend their certification far beyond the limits of the passages in which they occur.

It may be said of these words, and, indeed, of all these archæological indications of the Mosaic age in the literature of the Pentateuch, that they only tend to show that certain portions of the Pentateuch probably date from that period. These portions, however, are found upon examination to be from all the principal hypothetical authors which the critics find in the Pentateuch. How did such philological data come to be divided around among them? Facts of Egyptian history of that age might reasonably be supposed to be used in composition by all the different authors of documents at different ages of Bible history; but can any one imagine certain Egyptian words of peculiar use, belonging, as in some of these cases, exclusively to the Mosaic age, yet running all through these various authors of different ages and of different lands? That would look as though there must have been spiritual collusion among them, mind reaching out to mind across the centuries. And when it is noted how much of the narrative of those portions in which the Egyptian words occur is necessarily carried with the words, there is evidenced a still more inextricable mingling of the authors and the documents and the centuries, so that it begins already to look very much as though the whole Pentateuch was being carried with these Egyptian words to the Mosaic age.

Then, when the archæological data of the Mosaic age are laid all along the course of the Pentateuchal narrative, it is found to be so uniformly harmonious with that narrative, with the customs, the institutions, the topography, the itineraries, and the history, as far as these are known, all the way from the shadows of

Hebrew slavery in Egypt to the fifth year of Meremptah and the turning back from Kadesh Barnea, as to make one marvel that different authors in different centuries should have been so uniformly successful in the representations of historical fiction.

When it is still further noted that this narrative, which has such exactly corresponding archæological data, is so put together as to make a simple, natural, well-articulated, and symmetrical biography of a man, not such a haphazard man of irregular and fragmentary career as might be conceived to result from such incidental coming together of elements, but a colossal man of such grandeur and such climaxes as that not until the coming of the "Son of Man" could it be said that "a greater than Moses is here," then these archæological correspondences imperatively demand the composition of that whole connected story in the Mosaic age. It is quite believable that a single work of fiction, the work of one mind, and struck off at one time, may easily contain so symmetrical a life story. To most people it will not seem possible that a scrapbook should do so. Much less will it appear credible that a scrapbook made up of many and varied excerpts of different ages and put together finally by some one long after the time of all the original authors should accomplish this feat.

The schools of criticism that have sought to account for the Pentateuch in detail have not as yet been eminently and satisfactorily successful and, if they were so, yet would their task be but half finished. There would be yet remaining to them the colossal, and as yet unattempted, problem of accounting for the phenom-

ena of the Pentateuch as a whole in such a way as will be in harmony with the critical results upon the details. It seems a hopeless task to attempt to do this. And when side by side with these phenomena of the Pentateuch as a whole are found the phenomena of archæological history in exact and harmonious parallelism, the criticism which postulates authorship in the Mosaic age is the only criticism that presents the essential element of adequacy.

That there were some small additions made to the Pentateuch at a later date seems certain. That there may have been a few changes in some of the laws to adapt them to a later age is possible, if not even probable. These things do not militate against the original authorship in the Mosaic age. That there should still remain many difficulties, many dark passages, is quite to be expected. They are not more than Occidentals usually encounter in Oriental literature, or Orientals in Occidental literature. And if it be possible to conceive of the ancients reading a modern book, probably reason will require a larger margin still to be left to the dark places and the difficulties.

CHAPTER XXI

The National Period

The national period of Israel's career presents such a variety of subjects, covers such a breadth of history, and is paralleled at so much more frequent intervals by archæological results, that only the most important points of contact between Biblical and secular history can be noticed in this summary, and these only in a very comprehensive manner.

I. THE WIDENESS OF GOD'S PROVIDENCE

While the Israelites were journeying throughout the remainder of the forty years in the wilderness for their unbelief and weakness at Kadesh Barnea, the old generation died off and two generations of boys were born and reared, without government interference, to restore in some good measure the equilibrium of the sexes disturbed by the cruel repressive measures adopted by Egypt. The tribes were meanwhile cemented into a nation and the people somewhat grounded in the great teachings of revelation and their faith strengthened to be able for the task before which it failed at Kadesh Barnea. At the same time, changes were in progress in Palestine of which we have but indistinct information, and that only by the radiance that shines forward from the Tell Amarna period, and is reflected back from the conquest period. Certain it is that Palestine from being a great, strong province, first of Babylonia and then of Egypt, fell away

to a kind of independence that proved to be her own weakness. So that at the time Israel entered the land there was no strong, centralized government, but only various tribes apparently federated in some loose manner, as they are always mentioned together: "The Canaanites and the Hittites, and the Hivites, and the Perizzites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Jebusites." The authority within these tribes seems also to have been broken up so that every city had its "king," probably little more than a mayor, who acted with much independence in making war and concluding alliances. Such a state of affairs seems coming on in the second century before, as reflected in the Tell Amarna tablets. In that correspondence, Egyptian governors in Palestine report the disintegration of the provincial government before the "Habiri," probably "confederates." It is possible that these "confederates" are nearly the same as the group above referred to which is so often mentioned in the Scriptures, though there is as yet not sufficient evidence to establish this as a fact.

The two things that stand out clearly at the entrance of Israel into the promised land are the strength of the invaders and the weakness of the land. The wideness of God's providence, "like the wideness of the sea," took in both the sin of Israel on the one hand and the Canaanite national disintegration on the other. Thus the representations of Scripture for this period fit naturally and harmoniously into the conditions imposed by history as far as they are known to us.

II. THE GENEALOGICAL LISTS

One consideration suggested by the national life of Israel is best noticed here at this point, though the evidence is scattered far along the historical course. It is a truism that the operation of the law of cause and effect ever links human history backward and forward. Causes at work today are a prophecy of effects which will only be seen in some far away tomorrow. Effects apparent today link us irrefragably with a past which we cannot deny, if we would. The negro is a very real factor in American national life today. If the record of his past were blotted out of human annals, yet would his race proclaim his origin and his dialect equally attest his former relation to the white man. It is well to inquire here if the national life of Israel furnishes any facts which reach back beyond this point at which we have now arrived and link the national period of Israel with her past history; and especially to note how the career, which may thus be indicated, compares with the sacred record.

One such link is found in the genealogical lists. The Bible story represents the early history of the people of Israel to have been spent in Egypt during a long period of favoritism and prosperity followed by an uncertain, but probably shorter, period of harsh oppression and cruelty. Then came their escape. And we are quickly surprised to find that, at the first serious discomfort, the refugees were ready to return to Egypt. Evidently, despite its hardships, it still held much attraction for them. Then followed the making of the nation in the wilderness and the growth of a rival national spirit in Palestine.

Such history, if real, must inevitably be manifest in the names of the people. The days of prosperity in Egypt, whose attraction for them not even the hardships of slavery could so counteract that they should not be strongly drawn to return thither, must have resulted in the commingling of Egyptian and Hebrew names in Hebrew families. The changes which rapidly take place in the names of emigrants are well known. The same influences which operated when the people emigrated from Palestine to Egypt would operate again when they left Egypt for Palestine. After the Exodus and the beginning of the growth of the national spirit, these Egyptian names would as certainly pass out from among the people and soon disappear.

A comparison of the names in the genealogical lists with a list of Egyptian proper names presents great difficulties. The Egyptian is a dead language and, though Hebrew is still spoken, the ancient pronunciation of it is involved in almost as much uncertainty as if it also were a dead language. So that the equivalency of Hebrew letters and Egyptian characters has never been well made out. Different scholars have attempted the problem presented by the genealogical lists; none has ever entirely completed it. But some things are clear enough. There are in these lists some names undoubtedly Egyptian and many that have a suspiciously Egyptian appearance and a very uncertain and unsatisfactory Hebrew etymology. It is found upon examination that the Egyptian names in these lists and those suspected of being Egyptian all occur in those parts of the genealogies which represent the Egyptian period of Israel's history. They quickly

disappear after the Exodus and are not found at all in the later parts of the lists, while there come in, according to the same natural law, names with Eastern affiliations and perhaps also Eastern origin.

Thus the genealogical lists necessarily presuppose the general features of the Pentateuchal history. Here are manifest effects which require just such causes as are there recorded. If the things there related did not take place, *something very like them did.*

III. THE TIMES OF THE CONQUEST

Have we now come to the conquest period or have we not? Was there a conquest? At this point, perhaps more than at any other, the Bible narrative and the critical theory of Israel's history join issue. Here a stand has been made and it looks as if a decisive battle must be fought and finished. The narrative in Joshua plainly stands for a conquest. The critical theory repudiates that narrative, breaks it up into fragments and reconstructs a narrative out of it in such a way as to give a very different view of the history of that period, so that instead of the conquest there appears a gradual coming in and intermingling of Israelites with Canaanites and the final ascendency of the Israelites at a much later period, but with the firm and final establishment not until the emergence of the monarchy. Criticism makes a resolute stand upon the position that the excavations do not confirm the "P document"; out of which it is claimed the Book of Joshua was constructed, which document, it is said, is of a late origin variously estimated from the time of the Exile until some time after. It is therefore concluded that the history in this reconstructed Joshua is unreliable.

It is the recent excavation work in Palestine which has brought this dispute to such an acute stage. Formerly there was no source of information upon this period of Israel's history except the book of Joshua. Now there is appearing a kind of archæological book of Joshua to be laid along side of the other. The question in dispute is, Does it confirm the book of Joshua in its Biblical form or the reconstructed Joshua of the critics? and, strange to say, the further question, Does it establish the truth of the one it confirms?

Let us look fairly at both sides of the controversy. What state of things in Canaan between Israel and the Canaanites does the Biblical narrative at its face value demand at the conquest period, and what does this new archæological book of Joshua being constructed by the excavators evince for the same period in that land? We have already seen that the Israelites spoke the "language of Canaan" and were of the same race as the dominant element in the land. They occupied the vineyards and olive orchards and the "houses full of all good things." They had the same material for pottery and in the main the same uses for it.[1] They are represented to have fallen into many customs of the Canaanites and to have intermarried, though against their law,[2] with the people of the land. Finally, they did not drive out all the Canaanites, as they were commanded to do, but made alliances with many of them and dwelt together with them in joint occupancy of many cities and communities,[3] and so soon fell as it was said they would, under the seduction of Canaanite idolatry. After the days of Joshua, they lapsed very much into the Canaanite religion so that

it was not until in the period of the Judges and the beginning of the monarchy that the religion of Israel emerged for a time triumphant. This was only, as we know, to yield again in later times[1] until the northern kingdom perished altogether and the southern kingdom was finally cured of idolatry in Babylon.

Turning now to the results of the excavations,[2] we find that it is just such a state of things that is revealed by them at the same period. At Gezer, especially, the layers of *débris* are most clearly apparent. They are definitely marked by Egyptian remains and by the introduction of Hebrew jar-handles. There is manifested an intermingling of populations at Gezer at this period of the incoming of Israel. A joint occupancy is represented as in the sacred narrative. A decline in reverence for the High Place is manifested by the partial occupancy of it for the purpose of private dwellings. The coming down of a purer religion is to be noted in the speedy disappearance of the horrible child-sacrifices and the gradual and finally complete introduction of the beautiful symbolism[3] of the bowl and lamp deposit in tombs.

The results of the excavations, as far as they have progressed, show at this period exactly the kind and extent of changes demanded by the Bible narrative as it stands in the book of Joshua. This might seem at once to settle the question and decide against the critical view. It is here the strange issue is made upon which now the whole conflict at this point must be decided. The issue is this: whether or not the agreement of the excavations with the narrative as it stands

in the Bible, if made out beyond all question, does after all vindicate the book of Joshua in its present form. The advocates of the critical partition of the book take their stand upon the position that the excavations do not confirm the "P document." It is not necessary to go into a detailed description and illustration of that document. It is frankly admitted that when the book of Joshua is broken into the fragments produced by the critical hypothesis and according to the critical criteria, and the "P document" is separated and read by itself, the excavations do not confirm it. Its advocates then ask our further assent to the conclusion that the narrative in Joshua at its face value is by this discredited. This assumes the correctness of the critical partition of Joshua, which is the real question at issue. Indeed, if we may be allowed so harsh an expression, it begs that question. It puts the facts to the test of a theory, whereas the theory should be put to the test of the facts. Let us ask if there is anything in the situation created by the critical partition which points to a decision of this real question at issue. On this supposition that the critical partition is correct, what then shall we say of the work of the final redactor who put together these various documents so as to make up the book of Joshua as it stands in the Bible? How does it come that he so put together these fragments and so filled up the gaps that, when more than twenty five hundred years later this old civilization should be dug up, the things that should remain in the *débris* of ages would so exactly confirm this fabricated narratve which he had pieced together out of such inharmonious fragments? What kind of

prevision did this wonderful REDACTOR possess? May we expect such divine gift in one who is literally "making history"?

Will it not seem to most people that the failure of the excavations to confirm the "P document," considering all these circumstances and facts, discredits the critical partition which produced the "P document," rather than the complete narrative in Joshua from which this part of the "P document" is extracted? It does seem that a calm and faithful following of logical processes leads to this conclusion. The excavations in Palesine confirm the narrative of the conquest as it stands in the Bible. They do also substantiate this completed narrative as true at its face value.

Two questions, or we might say, a twofold question, arises at this point, perhaps second in interest only to the Pentateuchal question: the abrupt descent from the high plain of Pentateuchal history, doctrine, and legislation to the social, moral, political, and religious morass of the days of the Judges, and then the startlingly sudden emergence of the ecclesiastical institutions and establishment and the splendors of empire of the Davidic dynasty. A distinguished professor in one of our great theological seminaries, an adherent of the current critical views, in a recent conversation on the critical situation was asked, "Have you ever read over the Biblical narrative as it stands in the Bible with a view to judging of its naturalness when compared with archæological facts?" "Yes," said he, "and it fits exactly. But the trouble is that when we come on down among the people of the time of the Judges they know nothing of all these things." On

the other hand, another, of very conservative views, said that the problem at the other end of the period of the Judges when the glory of the monarchy flamed up so suddenly is to him equally inexplicable. These are the two problems and they are certainly real problems. Is there any solution?

It is very evident, even upon a cursory reading of the Pentateuchal books, that they record chiefly national doings under heroic leadership, and the revelation of God to his people, the nation, and through them to the world. Of the ordinary life of the common people there is comparatively little; and the little there is, is in striking contrast with the instruction set before the people. There is account of the pettishness of the people ready to break out in unreasonable complainings at the first occasion and upon slight provocation; the religious instability of the people ready to make a golden calf to take them back to Egypt and that under the very shadow of Sinai itself; and the vileness of the people after forty years of the wilderness training still ready to defile themselves with the whoredoms of the Moabite women. In short, the Pentateuch is a record of revelation and of divinely directed leadership. It is ideal, what God would have the people to be and do, and only to a very small extent sociological, a record of what the people were and did. Has any one supposed for a moment *that the people were like the Book?* In the record of the period of the Judges we learn what the people were like. The records of that period are records of the life and character of the people and are of a piece with the brief records of life in the Pentateuch above mentioned. Here is a sharp contrast between

precept and practice, between revelation and life. Here is a sociological record in the broadest sense. It gives us a glimpse of the trying out of the theocracy. The contrast between the idealism of the books of the law and the realism of this sociological record is disheartening. But is it surprising or strange? Does it present any real perplexity in the problems of national progress? Is it any more disheartening than the history of the conflict of the gospel of Jesus Christ with the heathenism of the Roman Empire or the contrast between the preaching of the missionaries in the Celestial Empire and the common life in the same communities of China today? Is it so much worse than the contrast between the Book in America and England in this XXth century and life in their great cities when iniquity is uncovered? Suppose, even, that a full record of the service and the sermon on a single Sabbath in a Christian church was laid side by side with an exact account of the life lived by some of the people. Were the Elamites as good as the Code of Hammurabi? Were the Athenians as righteous as the judgments of Solon? Was the Rome of Constantine as pious as his confession that made the Empire Christian? Is Christendom anywhere in the world, at any time in the history of the world, to be compared with the ideal of the Book? Then we may not wonder that the record of the life of the people after the conquest fell so far below the ideal set before them in the Pentateuch. If the Christian world in twenty centuries has gotten no further on in applied Christianity than appears today, if the pushing of the idea of applied Christianity to the front did not come until the end of

the nineteenth century of the Christian era, shall we wonder that it took Israel four centuries in the promised land so to work out her destiny under the influence of revelation as that her ecclesiastical institutions and her national spirit should emerge above the fogs of social, moral, political, and religious miasma? Shall we not rather wonder at *the emergence so soon?* Indeed, this is the greater of the two problems. Its very greatness helps to solve the other. For the sudden emergence of the culture of the times of the monarchy in the Bible record indicates that there was in reality no great moral descent from the wilderness life to the period of the Judges, much less that there is an impossible situation in the contrast between the Pentateuchal books and the subsequent Palestinian life, but that rather there was the same contrast between the teaching of the Pentateuch and the life of the people in the wilderness, as appears immediately afterward in Canaan, and that the emergence in the times of the Monarchy marks the first national attainment to so high a point *under the power of revelation.* That the emergence did come is undisputed. What goes before must be interpreted in accordance with that fact. The only ultimate and conclusive explanation is that given by Professor George Adam Smith for the change in religious culture of Canaan which took place at the conquest as manifested in the excavations at Gezer: "Surely it is only the inspiration of the Most High." *Only the Pentateuch in the wilderness can account for the emergence, within four hundred years,* of the religious establishment and the imperial glory of the days of David and Solomon. If mere heathenism could de-

velop into such high moral and religious ideas and life, why has it never done so elsewhere? Three millenniums of Jewish life since that time give no ground for belief in such racial distinction morally and spiritually as that there should be such unaided development among the people of Israel.

Yet there are some things which help us to understand the progress which prepared for the emergence. During all the four centuries of the moral and social marsh-life of Israel, the Book was in existence, but only in a written copy or at most a few written copies. The tabernacle was at Shiloh, however much neglected by the people. Jeremiah and the people to whom he spoke knew that the history of Shiloh and its tabernacle, the only history it had, was a real piece of history when he used it as a terrible warning to Jerusalem. So during these four centuries the people were learning something of the priesthood and the ritual and the ministry of prophecy.[1] Here and there arose a Gideon, a Naomi, a Boaz, and at last a Samuel. A national spirit and a political life were developing; at intervals the people roused themselves, threw off their apathy and with it their yoke; and at last in the providence of God there came one of those times that are *ready for a man*. And the man arose. There came a Menes in Egypt, though there were kings of a sort before Menes. There was a Romulus at Rome, for whatever legendary accretions the story may have acquired, there was a real emergence of the Roman monarchy. There came an Alfred the Great in England, who so far eclipzed his predecessors that the English nation seems almost to proceed from him.

And at another crisis in Anglo-Saxon liberty there came a Washington in America. So in the fullness of time, yet suddenly and startlingly for all that, there came a Saul and then a David and a Solomon in Israel. It is the way of God's law and God's providence in this world. There is a long period of gestation and then a birth; not a mere infinitesimal step forward in a evolution, but an *event*. The birth of an idea, the birth of an individual, the birth of a nation, the birth of a religion is always an event. "A nation shall be born in a day." To whatever a nation is born, it is always born thus. A birth is a *breaking forth*.

So, holding up our two problems to the mirror of history, the problem of the abrupt descent to the Judges and the problem of the sudden emergence at the Monarchy, we see their reflection in a thousand places. It does not take away the mystery of the problems to see them thus duplicated so many times. But it does take away any suspicion of unreality from the Bible narrative that contains them.

IV. THE POLITICAL HORIZON

We turn now from Israel's internal conflict with the people of the land to scan her political horizon. The age-long struggle between the inhabitants of the valley of the Great River and the people of the valley of the Nile was ever a menace on the horizon of Israel's political history from the conquest to the final dispersion of the Israelite nations among their enemies. The affairs of the people of Israel during this period are important for the most part only because of their relation to the revelation of God to men and the work-

ing out of the plan of salvation for the world. The constant recognition of this fact in the study of the narrative in the Bible is necessary in order to put the Bible account of events in their true light. The great importance they are given is usually in this one respect. Because it is so, great world-events sometimes are not given even passing notice, while affairs that are but trivial in the world-arena are set forth in great detail. These, so unimportant in themselves, have to do with the greatest subject in the world, the redemption of man. Considered simply as world-history, the affairs of the monarchy and of the divided monarchy are trivial indeed, if we except, perhaps, the brief period in the monarchy from the reign of David over all Israel to the accession of Rehoboam.

Palestinian sovereignty during all the rest of this long period of Israel's national life was like a football tossed by the eastern and the western contestants now toward one goal and now toward the other. Israel's part in this great struggle is one of the most pathetic pieces of international history the whole world has produced. Rightly to adjust ourselves between Israel's transcendent importance as the depositary of revelation and the channel of the world's hope of salvation and Israel's international insignificance and the oft-repeated humiliation of her sovereignty as the football of empires is the great problem of the comparison between Bible history and archæological results for this period in Bible lands.

1. *Egypt.* On the western horizon of Israel ever hovered the Hawk of Egypt before which the people of the Promised land were always as partridges on the

mountains. The Hawk ever hung aloft watching her opportunity from the earliest patriarchal days down over the conquest and the period of the kings until the Persian finally frightened her back never more to leave the shade of her palm-groves by the side of the Nile. Palestine was, for long, a province of Egypt. Indeed, Egypt always claimed her as such by right, and ceased not to push that claim to the front at every favorable opportunity. On one spot, at least, the old city of Gezer, she always kept a hold, if no more, at times, than a diplomatic hold. Her presence and great influence here is manifest by the great abundance of scarabs of all ages from the XIIth dynasty onward. Probably some insight into the underlying causes in the time of Joshua is afforded by this evident influence of Egypt at Gezer. It is recorded in Judges,[1] of this period of the time of Joshua, that "Neither did Ephraim drive out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer; but the Canaanites dwelt in Gezer among them." One reason for this may have been the fear of the resistance of Egypt at this point. The sacred writers still pursue their purpose to write religious history rather than world history, so that we hear nothing more of Egypt at Gezer until the days of Solomon. By a diplomatic marriage the great king got,[2] as a dower with an Egyptian wife, this old city of Gezer. Two things are made plain by this transaction: Egypt made good her claim to the city, and Solomon acknowledged the claim. As already fully shown, the theory of the "desert Egypt"[3] in the northern Paran finds not a trace of confirmation at Gezer, where certainly such traces ought to appear, if Gezer were a part of the domain

of the king of that region. And, on the other hand, the real Egypt is represented throughout this period by abundant remains at this old Canaanite city.

Now for a few years the relative greatness of Palestine in world affairs, as made known by the history of the world empires of that day, was almost equal to her isolated grandeur as depositary of the world's redemption in which she appears in the sacred record of the imperial reign of Solomon. There was quietness along both the Nile and the Euphrates. The sovereignty of Palestine was allowed to repose in peace and strength at Jerusalem undisturbed. For about a quarter of a century the glorious vision of the complete possession of the promised land was fulfilled.

But Egypt, though quiescent, was not asleep nor content. Jeroboam knew where to go when he wished to find refuge, and he was not disappointed. Pharaoh gave him shelter. At a later period Jeroboam became openly an insurrectionist, and then led the rebellion at the rupture of the kingdom.[1] Whether or not he appealed to Shishak for help we do not know. He might naturally think he could expect help from Egypt, but the Pharaoh was thinking not of Jeroboam, but of the selfish reason for which Egypt had given refuge to Solomon's rebellious and dangerous subject. Shishak came up with his great army and helped . . . . *himself*. The list of despoiled Palestinian cities which Shishak has left on the south wall of the temple at Karnak shows that he ravaged the kingdom of Israel about as much as the kingdom of Judah.[2] The momentous event of this campaign, however, was the capture of Jerusalem and the robbing of the Temple only about

twenty-five years after it was completed and furnished.[1] Thus the ancient claim of the right of Egypt to reign over Palestine was once more asserted, and the brief period of Palestine's international greatness was at an end. Biblical references to these international events are very brief (for the main purpose of the Bible is often not concerned with either international greatness or insignificance) but they are plain enough and they are exactly confirmed by the records of Egypt.

No exception to this statement needs to be made because of the mention of the "field of Abram"[2] by Shishak at Karnak. The advocates of the reconstructive criticism have been pointing[3] to this as the first mention of the name "Abram" outside of the Bible, and claiming in their favor a presumption that the name was not known much before this time of Shishak; and that the personality of Abraham as it appears in the patriarchal narrative is only a reflection thrown back from these times. The name of Abraham would be most welcome in the inscription of Shishak or in any other inscription earlier or later. The triviality of the evidence in this case which critics may be able to find in the mere absence of other mention of the name in discoveries to this present time hardly needs comment here, for the reason that the reading "field of Abram" is all but impossible; some of the ablest Egyptologists say entirely impossible.[4] This alleged "field of Abraham," with the critical inference from it, and the hypothetical "desert Egypt" are the only shadows of archæological evidence which have yet appeared to challenge the Biblical narrative for this national period of the history of Israel, and they are no more than shadows.

From this time on, events on the western horizon of Israel's national history followed the inevitable course, sometimes in very rapid succession. The parallelism of the sacred story and the "tale of the potsherds" is accepted by nearly all scholars. A very rapid survey of this part of the political horizon of Israel from this point to the end of the period will suffice.

Now began in deadly earnest the struggle between the East and the West, between the Euphrates and the Nile. Egypt was in possession of the suzerainty of Palestine, but the growing Assyrian power would not long leave her in peaceful and undisputed enjoyment of it. Hezekiah was driven to great straits by the threatenings of Sennacherib,[1] and sought safety through an alliance with Tirhaka of Egypt, and still more through reliance upon Jehovah and intercession by the prophet Isaiah. Tirhaka sallied forth to attack the Assyrian who left the siege of Lachish to meet his enemy at the border of Egypt. Secular historians unite with the sacred narrative in attributing Sennacherib's overthrow to the sudden death of 185,000 of his army.[2] The Bible says the angel of the Lord accomplished this defeat, but does not tell us what agency was used by the angel or what was the appearance of death among those men. Berosus, quoted by Josephus, says that it was a pestilence. Egyptian records also, confirm the Biblical description of Tirhaka as king of Ethiopia. The Ethiopian king had taken the Egyptian throne, and so was primarily "king of Ethiopia," as he is called in the Bible.

The next pivotal point in the relation between Palestine and Egypt is where the great Necho first went out in his vain hope of putting an end to the ever-increasing menace of the Assyrian power. Josiah, with much foolhardiness, and against the kindly and pathetic appeal of Necho for peaceful continuance of their existing relations, compelled the Pharaoh to fight at Megiddo. Josiah was slain. Necho went on in pursuit of his original purpose for the time. His campaign was a disappointment. The Assyrian army did not give him decisive battle. On his return toward Egypt, he visited Jerusalem, deposed the new king Jehoahaz, made Eliakim king, and changed his name to Jehoiakim, and carried Jehoahaz captive to Egypt. The Egyptian vassalage of the kingdom of Judah was thus the more firmly established.

The Assyro-Babylonian power grew greater and greater. Again Necho advanced threateningly to the Euphrates. This time he was not disappointed in the hope of meeting his great foe, but utterly disappointed in the hope of overthrowing him. Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian, had come to the throne. He met Necho near the Euphrates, and the battle of Carchemish proved to be the Waterloo of Egypt. With the victory of Carchemish went naturally the suzerainty of Palestine. Jerusalem fell easily before the power of the Great King. Only once more did Egypt make serious attempt to possess herself of the coveted Palestinian prize, which had thus passed to the Babylonian crown. It was when Pharaoh Hophra, at the second taking of Jerusalem, made his disastrous attempt to succor the city by attacking the besieging army of Nebuchadnezzer. He was utterly crushed.

At this time Jeremiah, carried away with those who fled from Jerusalem to Hophra[1] for refuge, still hurling his threatenings against Judah for trusting in this broken reed instead of trusting in Jehovah, enacted his dramatic prophecy in the "brickwork," in front of the palace gate at Tahpanhes. The account of this event has been almost as dramatically vindicated by Petrie's discovery in the ruins of the palace.[2] "Pavements" had been unknown in Egyptian ruins, or rather the real character of such a "pavement" misunderstood. Was it likely that there was one here? The palace was uncovered and, lo! the "pavement," a slightly raised platform of "brickwork" exactly where the prophet had said. As the "mortar"[3] in which the bricks at Pithom were laid, an uncommon thing in Egyptian ruins, so this "pavement," also, points to the remarkable accuracy of the sacred writings even when they contradict what is thought to be well-known and established.

The Bible presents Israel's history in its relation tc God's providence, the monuments in its relation to political influences and other natural causes. The Bible and the monuments present, for this period of Israel's national life, just such differing views and complementary statements as any such dual treatment of a subject must always produce. Thus the Scripture representations of Egypt's part in the great international struggle for the suzerainty of Palestine exactly accord with all the knowledge we have on the subject from Egyptian sources at the present time.

Between Egypt and Babylonia lay three parts of Israel's international political horizon, now to be noted, of lesser importance and of which far less is known.

2. *Philistia.* Along the Mediterranean border there stretched the Philistines, who so asserted themselves after the conquest that they reduced all Israel in the time of the Judges and the beginning of the Monarchy to a state of abject terror, and drove many to caves and holes in the mountains.[1] They disarmed the nation, even took away the smithies[2] that they might not make arms for themselves, yet seem never to have established any government among the Israelites. The Philistines are still today as great a mystery as were the Hittites a few years ago. The occasional probable mention of them in inscriptions, with the possible discovery of some of their tombs at Gezer,[3] though with nothing distinctive in them, is all that is known of this people aside from the Scripture narrative. The strange story of their power is not yet corroborated, but, calling to mind the recent Hittite discoveries, he would be a venturesome critic, indeed, who should presume to discredit the Bible story because of the absence of any other information concerning this remarkable people.

3. *Moab.* Along the eastern border of the Jordan lay Moab. From this quarter of the horizon of Israel's history comes the Moabite stone, one of the greatest contributions which archæology has made to Biblical science. But neither from this monument nor from any other source is there much of political importance from this part of the horizon. The Moabite stone sheds some light upon the relations between Mesha king of Moab and the house of Omri of the northern kingdom of Israel. There are some things in the statements of Mesha on the monument[4] which at first sight seem

to contradict the Biblical narrative. They are not, however, impossible as merely supplementary statements of fact. Facts are ofttimes very antagonistic and may be actively at war with each other. In this they only reflect the attitude of the persons who enact them. But if they be really facts, there is room for them all. They do not shove each other off the face of the earth nor out of a rightful place in history. Even if the statements of Mesha and of the author of the book of Second Kings be found in this case to be positively contradictory, it does not follow that the Bible account is discredited. It would become, then, a question of veracity which must be decided upon sufficient evidence from both sides.

The great value of the Moabite stone is of a very different kind from the value of information concerning international politics. For one thing, it contains the first reference from external sources to Jehovah worship[1] in the religion of Israel. The silence of the monuments to this time on this subject has no special significance, as they do not seem to have had special occasion to mention Israel's God. The positive statement of Mesha is of great importance. It indicates that which also appears in Scripture—but which, by reason of the persistent condemnation of Israel's lapses into idolatry, is apt to be overlooked—that, despite the iniquity of Jeroboam the son of Nebat who made Israel to sin, and of the kings of Israel and Judah who came after him and who walked in his footsteps, even to Ahab who "did worse than them all," still, in the time of Mesha, Jehovah was distinctively the "God of Israel".

That value of the Moabite stone which transcends all other, however, is its epigraphic value.[1] It has furnished for nearly half a century the best and the most, if not also the earliest, evidence concerning the system of writing in vogue among the Hebrews for their own language. The data it supplied was complete, the information it gave and the direction it indicated in epigraphic research correct. Its excellent and well-developed alphabet being superior in that most important combination of legibility and simplicity to any even of the so-called scientific alphabets of today, it has seemed to many to point to a literary development that might well reach back over the whole period of Israel's national life to the Exodus itself. Later discovery of the Siloam inscription, the Gezer Calendar tablet, and other fragments of lesser importance and now especially the Epigraphic discoveries at Byblos, uniformly serve to strengthen and confirm this forecast of information on the literary character of the preceding age.

These facts, together with the direction in which they point, are of the utmost importance in the literary criticism not only of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, but of all the historical books down to the time of Mesha. They do not disprove the critical view which places most or all of this Biblical literature after this date, but they do take away the rear defense of that view. For as long as there were no indications of the literary character of this age, it was possible to theorize against it with much plausibility, and impossible to defend decisively an earlier date for the historical books or urge with conclusiveness the possibility of the trans-

mission of the Pentateuch over this literary *terra incognita*. So, while the theory of the late origin of the Hebrew alphabet was not *necessary* to the late view of the authorship of the Pentateuch, it was *very convenient* as a rear defense of that view. It is this defense that is now being so badly broken down and, indeed, altogether removed.

The confident belief of the people in Josiah's day that the preceding age back to the time of their national hero Moses had been a literary age, as manifested by their readiness to receive the book "found" as from the great lawgiver, is in exact accord with these indications from the results of archæological research. The seemingly impossible obstacle to the traditional view of the date of the book "found" is taken away. It is not only possible, but essentially probable, that a literary age would have produced some religious literature. The defense of the early date for all these portions of Scripture which purport to have come from an early time is made much easier, and the advocacy of a later authorship has lost its most comfortable and convenient shelter. Here at this point in the discussion both criticism and archæology await further discoveries.

4. *Syria.* The third and last of these sections of Israel's horizon, of lesser importance, lying between Egypt and Assyria, is the southern kingdom of Syria, with capital at Damascus. These Syrians, Israel's immediate neighbors to the northeast, were "kin by blood, rivals in politics, diverse in worship". Israel and Syria were small neighbors in the world of nations usually standing together against their common great enemies from the Euphrates and the Nile; and, like

small neighbors, often quarreling between themselves when not threatened by greater foes.

The account of these fluctuating political relations is most interesting both in the Bible record and in the results of archæological research. It illustrates many things in the Bible narrative and furnishes much material for exegetical work and for the pulpit, but little that bears upon the critical questions of the day, much less helps to determine them. So, it furnishes nothing that need be given a place in this glance at the progress of archæology in testing the Biblical narrative and settling questions raised by criticism.

5. *Assyria.* We lift up our eyes now toward that whole great segment of Israel's political horizon which lies toward the Euphrates. Besides the comparatively unimportant relations of Israel with Syria at which we have glanced, there lay far beyond this the supremely important relations of Israel with Assyria and with Babylonia. There is generally unanimity concerning the facts of Israel's history on this quarter of the horizon and the agreement of these facts as brought to light by research with the statement of the facts in the Bible account. It is only, for the most part, when the bearing of these facts upon the literary questions of Scripture comes under consideration that scholars part company, the advocates of the reconstructive theory insisting that archæology harmonizes with their views; and those who oppose that theory and hold to the view of Israel's history presented by the Bible narrative as a finished product believing, not only that archæologidal results do not contradict their view and do harmonize with it in the general way

claimed by their opponents for their own view, but also that they give it positive support.

Let us take a rapid survey of the facts as generally received by all. Many of them have already necessarily come into view in considering Israel's relation to Assyria's great enemy, Egypt.

Shalmaneser II put Jehu to tribute.[1] This was the beginning of the end of the northern kingdom. The Scripture narrative, from its characteristic viewpoint, dwells upon the relation of Israel's troubles to Israel's sin, and gives no definite account of this event; while Shalmaneser, also characteristically, portrays the long line of those who bear the rich booty which he had received from the capital at Samaria. Somewhat later, the Assyrian scepter displaced that of Israel altogether and itself passed, in the very midst of the final conflict at Samaria, from the hand of Shalmaneser IV to the hand of Sargon II as the northern kingdom disappeared forever from all history sacred or profane.

Soon after the fall of Samaria, Sennacherib is knocking at the gates of Jerusalem, when the approach of Hezekiah's ally, Tirhaka, summons him to meet his great enemy, Egypt. He responds and meets in addition his greater enemy, the angel of Hezekiah's God. In one night the "185,000" of his army perished.[2]

This crushing disaster to Sennacherib followed by internal dissensions at the Assyrian capital accords with the time of peace and prosperity at Jerusalem, of which the Bible tells us,[3] and which came to an end when Josiah foolishly struck at the passing host of Necho on its way to renew the great struggle with the East for supremacy.[4] Upon Necho's return from his

inconclusive campaign, he strangled, as we have seen, the Judean sovereignty and left but a gasping, half-lifeless body, a mere semblance of the former dignity and greatness of royalty there.[1]

6. *Babylonia.* Then came that final struggle between East and West for Palestine, with Necho leading Egypt and the Neo-Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar at the head of the Assyro-Babylonian empire. At Carchemish, Jerusalem passed forever from Egyptian vassalage, struggled at first against Babylonian sovereignty, and then expired amidst blood and ashes.[2]

Few of the facts of this long historical period of Israel's national life, which archæology has made known to us so clearly touch points of serious controversy in criticism; but everywhere the meaning of the Biblical history is made out in the light of the world's history by the wonderful results of a century of archæological research. One hundred years ago, with the exception of a few corroborative statements by classical historians, this part of the Bible history stood absolutely unsupported. Today, after a century of testing at a hundred points, practically this whole historical field has been proved up.

V. PROPHETIC HISTORY AND LITERATURE

Archæological evidence concerning the great struggle between the East and the West for Palestine has to do with the conditions reflected in the historical books of the Bible; that concerning the exiles has to do with the conditions reflected in prophecy, Jonah and Nahum for Nineveh, Isaiah and Daniel for Babylon, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Haggai and Malachi for the return and the

rehabilitation. Archæological discoveries have been very numerous and of great value in almost all lands and at every period of history covered by these prophecies, but that value has been chiefly hermeneutical. A flood of light is let in upon the imagery of Bible diction from the revelations archæology has afforded concerning the institutions, laws, manners and customs, flora and fauna, industry, commerce and wars of this period. All this helps to complete the sacred picture of life which has been blurred by the forgetfulness of time, and also, in a general way, gives confirmation of the correctness of the sacred story.

But, of special apologetic value, archæological results have as yet for this long prophetic period yielded comparatively little. There are but a few instances in which the discoveries of archæology have illuminated the questions which are of special interest in the critical controversies of the day. Very much has become known of the life, and especially the royal life, of Nineveh,[1] yet very little that has any bearing upon the critical questions so much kept to the front concerning its prophet Jonah and his prophecy. There is some light upon the fish-god[2] of the Babylonian coast, believed to come out upon the land and instruct men, which may afford some explanation of the form of Jonah's deliverance by which was shown Jehovah's power over the gods of the heathen, and at the same time would seem to take advantage of the disposition of the people to hear and heed such a person coming out of the sea. There is nothing in archæological results that verifies the critical theory of the mythical character of the whole story. Nor, indeed, anything

decisive on the subject. An admirable critical discussion of the bearing of archæological discoveries on prophecy has recently come from the pen of Harold M. Wiener, Esq.

That portion of Jeremiah's career spent with the refugees at Tahphanhes has been fully presented when considering the political horizon along the Egyptian border of Israel's history.[1] Archæological research throws little light upon any questions concerning the remainder of this prophet's career. Aside from hermeneutic illumination, there is little that bears upon the work and writings of this prophet.

The remaining prophetic history, like that already noticed, is very rich in the interpretive value of the archæological discoveries bearing upon it, not only at Jerusalem, but in Assyria and in Babylonia. The account of these discoveries and the recognition of the light they throw across the divine page is a most entrancing story; but the telling of it would be quite foreign to the purpose of this book on the deciding voice of the monuments, and especially of this Third Part of the book, which is only to set forth the Bible as archæology makes it to appear in the present stage of critical discussion.

The two principal remaining points of criticism which archæology illustrates, the most important, indeed, in the whole latter portion of Israel's history and upon the eastern part of her political horizon, are the unity of Isaiah and the life and book of Daniel.

1. *The unity of Isaiah.* The unity of Isaiah is primarily a literary question exclusively. Latterly, however, some advocates of a partition of the book between

two or more authors have urgently pressed a claim for positive archæological support for their theory. At first glance at least, as we shall see, there is a fair degree of plausibility in the claim. The reader shall now judge for himself whether or not this plausibility is sustained upon a careful examination of the evidence.

It is pointed out by some critics that the "Deutero-Isaiah" gives a most graphic description of the difficulties and dangers of the return journey of the exiles to the homeland that he might cheer them by his exalted faith and hope to brave all.

"The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." [1]

"When thou passeth through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee."[2]

"Thus saith the Lord, which maketh a way in the sea, and a path in the mighty waters; which bringeth forth the chariot and horse, the army and the power. They shall lie down together, they shall not rise; they are extinct, they are quenched as tow. Remember ye not the former things, neither consider the things of old. Behold, I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth; shall ye not know it? I will even make a way in

the wilderness, and rivers in the desert. The beast of the field shall honor me, the dragons and the owls; because I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen. This people have I formed for myself; they shall set forth my praise."[1]

Again, the vivid description of the transport of the heathen gods on the backs of "donkeys" is relied upon as most conclusive when compared with certain archæological evidence presently to be stated. This ludicrous portraiture of the helplessness of the gods is in the following language:

"Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth; their idols were upon the beasts, and upon the cattle; your carriages were heavy laden; they are a burden to the weary beast. They stoop, they bow down together; they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity."[2]

The archæological evidence confidently relied upon by some as not merely harmonizing with the divisive theory, but positively confirming it, is brought out as follows. It is pointed out that the accuracy and vividness of the description of the difficulties and the dangers of the return journey are startling; the wild beasts, the swelling rivers, the scorching flame of the desert under the unclouded sun, the unprepared way in the wilderness along the desert caravan road—all this, it is said, reflects the frame of mind of one preparing for the journey, the fervor of the enthusiast in an exalted state striving to nerve others for the journey by stirring the heroic in the national character.

The description of the transport of the idols is then laid along side of this inscription of Cyrus:

"From the month Chislu to the month Adar, the gods of Accad whom Nabonidus had carried to Babylon, returned I to their cities."[1] Here, it is urged, was a dramatic scene passing before the eyes of the "Deutero-Isaiah" which he described in the words above quoted.

Thus far the case seems quite plausible. But this is not all that is to be said on the subject. According to the theory, as also according to the Bible narrative, Isaiah remained in Palestine. He was not in the captivity nor ever made that dreadful journey. On the other hand, it is said, the "Deutero-Isaiah" grew up in Babylon and remained there until the return. Neither of them is supposed, up to the time of the prophecy, to have traveled the road between Babylon and Jerusalem. The road, however, was well known and much traveled by government officials and messengers, so that information was available concerning it at both ends of the road and quite *as available at Jerusalem as in Babylon.* Is it not, indeed, the common experience that it is among provincials on the outposts of empire rather than among the inhabitants of the seat of government that such hardships are most to the front as a topic of conversation? Certainly the dangers and difficulties of this route could be appreciated as well from Jerusalem as from Babylon, and the prophet, wrought up (by his great desire to prepare the people to return) to the exalted state evinced in the prophecy could have written the description as vividly at Jerusalem as in Babylon. Thus the archæological evidence is quite as available for Isaiah as the author of this part of the prophecy as for the "Deutero-Isaiah."

Turning to the second part of the archæological evidence adduced to sustain the critical partition of Isaiah, it will be discovered that a close examination of it is not encouraging to that theory. The inscription of Cyrus speaks only of the return from captivity; "The gods of the land . . . . returned I to their cities." The prophet, on the other hand, speaks only of the going into captivity,—"are gone into captivity." The manner of the transport "upon the beasts and upon the cattle," though used with telling effect in the sarcasm of the prophet directed against the heathen gods, does not enter into this controversy, for the reason that the "beasts," probably donkeys, and the "cattle" were the common carriers of the age and the land. Whenever gods went "into captivity" or were "returned to their cities," it would be by such means. But the discrepancy between the prophecy about the going "into captivity" and the inscription of Cyrus about the return "to their cities" is of vital importance in the discussion. Isaiah, looking forward to all the events connected with the captivity, would naturally speak not of the return "to their cities," but of the going "into captivity," as it is in the prophecy. Not so the supposed "Deutero-Isaiah." He, if writing, as is claimed, of the return "to their cities" in the days of Cyrus, would have turned his sarcasm definitely upon the helplessness of the gods who had to be *taken home* "upon the beasts and upon the cattle," yet of this he makes no mention whatever.

Certainly this piece of evidence has made no progress for the view that would turn this part of the prophecy into history. It is not contended that this archæo-

logical evidence, or any other archæological evidence yet produced, is decisive on this question of the unity of Isaiah, but only that it is consistent with the unity, and that it is not so consistent with the divisive theory.

2. *The life and book of Daniel.* The question of the life and the book of Daniel has been put by some one in the laconic form, "Did Daniel write Daniel?" Are we to accept the historico-prophetic view that Daniel was an historic person and a prophet, who lived and prophesied in Babylon in the days of the exile, and that the book bearing his name embodies his prophecies and was written by him or by some one in his times, the age-long view which the Christian faith has taken over; or is that faith now to be adapted to the apocalyptic view that Daniel may have been, or may not have been, an historical person, but that, in any case, the book of Daniel is a product of the Maccabean age when the apocalyptic method, the turning of history into visions, was common, and after the events so specifically narrated in Daniel had become history?

It is entirely beyond the province of this book to enter upon a full discussion of this question. Except that archæology has made contributions of evidence of use in the discussion, it would not be mentioned at all. Only certain objections urged against the historico-prophetic view of Daniel and in favor of the apocalpytic view upon which archæological evidence directly bears are here to be noticed. These objections, made at various times in the course of the controversy—some of them still vigorously pressed—are:

That Belshazzar is not mentioned by any secular historian;

That Nebuchadnezzar is called the father of Belshazzar, though he "did not belong to the same family";

That Babylon was not taken in the manner described in the book of Daniel;

That no such person as Darius the Mede is known; and

That some of the musical instruments named are Greek, most reasonably and naturally to be expected in Babylon after the time of Alexander the Great.

To these objections, in order, archæology makes answer:

Belshazzar is now a well-known personage. Nabonidus in a prayer to the moon-god Sin pleads: "And as for me, Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, protect thou me from sinning against thy exalted godhead, and grant thou me graciously a long life; and in the heart of Belshazzar, my first-born son, the off-spring of my loins, set the fear of thine exalted godhead, so that he may commit no sin and that he may be satisfied with the fullness of life!"[1]

Nebuchadnezzar was not the immediate father of Belshazzar. By the well-known Oriental usage of those times, and of all times down to the present, the words father and son both may denote less immediate relationship than among us, and may even be used of official precedence or succession, or merely fittingly to express appearances and show courtesy where no real kinship whatever exists. Did not Elisha say to Elijah, "My father, my father!"[2] Bedouins of the desert call young men of a party "sons" and an older man the "father."

Belshazzar was not the immediate son of Nebuchadnezzar, but of Nabonidus. Nor was Nabonidus the

son of Nebuchadnezzar. But there is much evidence which points to a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar as the wife of Nabonidus and the mother of Belshazzar.[1] Moreover, if there was no evidence on the subject, it is always to be kept in mind that kings do have daughters, that the sexes are about equal in number, and that there is thus always an equal probability of a prince being descended in the royal line through his mother as through his father. There is here no impossibility or even improbability in Daniel's account of Belshazzar's descent.

All the events in the taking of Babylon are not yet understood, but much has become clear. The chronicle of Nabonidus says: "In the month of Tammuz, Cyrus, when he made battle in Kesh (Opis) on the banks of the river Zalzallat, with the soldiers of Accad, conquered the inhabitants of Accad. On the 14th, Sippara was taken without a battle. Nabonidus fled. On the 16th Gobryas, the governor of the land of Gutium, and the soldiers of Cyrus entered Babylon without a battle. Later Nabonidus was captured because he tarried in Babylon. To the end of the month the shield bearers of Gutium guarded the gates of Esagila. No arms of any kind were taken into Esagila or into the shrines; nor was the standard carried in. On the third day of Marchesvan Cyrus entered Babylon. Difficulties were cleared. (?) Peace was established for the city. Cyrus proclaimed peace for all Babylonia and from the month Kislev unto Adar the gods of Accad whom Nabonidus had brought to Babylon returned to their cities. In Marchesvan, by night, on the 11th, Gobryas in . . . and the son of the king was killed. From the 27th

of Adar, until the 3d of Nisan there was lamentation in Accad. All the people bowed their heads."[1]

It is already evident that most of the events of the taking of Babylon as described in the Bible did take place, and there is no necessary conflict between the account in Daniel and the account by Nabonidus. The chronicler is interested in the great affairs of the army of Cyrus and the political changes in the land, and so describes many things of which Daniel makes no mention. The sacred historian, on the other hand, from his characteristic viewpoint of God's providence, makes most out of that later portion of the military operations when "In Marchesvan, by night, on the the eleventh, Gobryas in . . . . and the son of the king was killed." The archæological evidence supplements the Bible account very much, but presents nothing contradictory to it, and makes nothing in it improbable.

Darius the Mede is still a mysterious person, but not as mysterious as he was; nor was he ever quite as mysterious as he was sometimes represented to be. "Xenophon says that a Mede succeeded to the throne of Babylon. He gives him the name Cyaxeres."[2] Aeschylus in his *Persae* mentions a Mede as the first leader, followed by Cyrus. There occurs in the scholiast upon Aristophanes this statement, "The Daric (*i.e.* the coin) is not named from Darius (Hystaspes) the father of Xerxes, but from another preceding king."

That Cyrus would have subordinate rulers in the provinces is a certainty. Professor R. D. Wilson[3] has shown that there are five Assyrio-Babylonian words meaning in Aramaic "king." Three of these denote

subordinate rulers. Any of these words might be rendered into Hebrew by "king." Further he has shown, what is apparent even in the English Bible, that "king" sometimes means little more than mayor of a city.

Finally, a general of Cyrus' army, Gobryas, whose name is Median, plainly appears in command at Babylon at the time the Persians began their rule; he "took the kingdom." Considering that it was common, as it is still common for Eastern monarchs as well as Western monarchs, to have several names it is not at all impossible that the Cyaxeres of Xenophon, Gobryas of Nabonidus, and "Darius the Mede" are one and the same person. He would be a hardy critic, indeed, who would dare to say that "Darius the Mede" is impossible.

Greek musical instruments with Greek names did for a long time seem to "harmonize" with Daniel's critics. They have furnished very tuneful music as an accompaniment to the critical presentation of the "apocalypse" of Daniel. But of late some very discordant notes have been detected. Some Greek archæologists now claim that there are indications that Greek music was an introduction from the East, probably from Persia. The tendency of musical instruments to carry their names with them is well known. It is certain that there was a very wide intercourse of Greeks with other nations as early as the XVIIIth and XIX Egyptian dynasties, about nine hundred years before Nebuchadnezzar. W. Max Müller finds those whom he believes to be Ægeans in Egypt about 2500 B.C., and Mesopotamians on the Nile at the same early date.[1]

It is evident that there was intermingling of foreign peoples over the East at a much earlier date than has been generally thought. If East and West met in Egypt, might not there be at this common meeting-place an interchange of arts and refinements, and might there not be other common meeting-places for the people of East and West? There is nothing impossible in Greek minstrels themselves being present in the great orchestra of Nebuchadnezzar at his late date.

Here again, in the discussion of Daniel, as in the discussion of Isaiah, the archæological evidence is not yet complete. Daniel has not been found, and not certainly Darius the Mede. It is not claimed that the testimony of the evidence is entirely decisive on all points. But the evidence thus far produced tends toward the establishment of the historical character of both Daniel and his book. Great progress has been made, and, if some questions are yet far from settled, we may await with calmness the final decision by archæological evidence which may come at any time.

From this brief review of the bearing of the results of archæological research upon questions raised by criticism, it appears that attempts to reconstruct the Biblical narrative, and with it the history of revelation, and to bring Israel's religion into conformity with the principles usually applied in the comparative study of religions, are not being sustained; that, rather, history narrated by the sacred writers, with all its startling outbursts in civilization and unaccountable lapses in religion and morals, is perfectly natural in method.

In fact, the evolutionary theory applied strictly as a constructive or reconstructive principle is as antago-

nistic to genius with its marvels of progress, and to cataclysm with its besom of destruction, as to revelation with its message from God. Thus it needs constantly to be accommodated to the ebbs and flow of disaster and of genius when applied to known history and is utterly untrustworthy when applied to unknown or disputed history.

This review in Part III has also presented in outline the Bible at its face value as it appears in the present light from archæological research. Let us put aside altogether for the moment the question of the date when the books of the Bible were put in their present form. They are in that form. The Bible has a face value. No matter how much that value be repudiated as a false value, *it exists*. Let us for the moment, then, consider the books and the Book as they stand. When so considered and compared with the results of archæological research, we have found that there is agreement of the Book in a remarkable way with those results, and in no case, is there lack of harmony with them. Thus the *face value of the Book* is the *archæological value of the ancient world*. Let us now attempt to bring back the question of the date of the arrangement of the books which gives the present face value of Scripture. Who was it that so put together the statements found in the books as to produce a face value which is receiving constant and uniform corroboration from the archæological value of the ancient world now coming to light? Was this done by "holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost?" or was it done by several late redactors "inspired" to such literary efforts by the well-meant

though selfish and misleading designs of a priesthood who, by composing books of heroic national religious history and attributing laws to a great national hero, thought to kindle the fires of religious zeal upon the altars of patriotism? Could such inspiration account for the agreement of the face value of the Book with the archæological value of the ancient world?

CHAPTER XXII

Conclusion

There is a dear old friend of childhood days who has conveyed to us many vivid impressions of his childhood home and early associations, of the life lived round about him, and of the character of the times gone by. We have been much interested and instructed and influenced by his story and have trusted him implicitly. But some persons have cautiously, yet seriously, raised a question concerning his trustworthiness as a story-teller; have, indeed, though with very politely-turned phrases, called his veracity in question. They have said that his childhood home and associations, his life and times, were not such as he has caused us to think. They have hastened to explain that he is really an excellent moral teacher, but, in his illustrative material and much more in his arrangement of it, he is quite a romancer.

We have been much troubled by these things and have gone to the old home of our dear friend to see for ourselves whether or not these things be so. We have visited the old hearthstone, studied the old home life and neighborhood customs and folklore; have inquired among the old neighbors, have searched the old records and have even gone to the old cemetery to study the names of the dead. Many things have been found exactly as our old friend represented; many things have been learned of which he had told us nothing at all; but what has interested us most of all is that in

all the old community nothing has been found in the least degree inconsistent with the story he had told us. So we have come home to love and to trust him more than ever before, because convinced in our minds that it is a moral impossibility for him to be such a romancer and yet never be contradicted by the facts.

Which things are a parable. From the standpoint of archæology, the whole Biblical question now raised by critical controversy may be put thus. The Bible is our old friend. It has given us many and vivid impressions concerning its childhood home and early associations, the life and times, institutions and history, civilization and revelation, out of which it came. But there have come in these latter days those who have raised questions concerning the trustworthiness of the sacred writings. With protestations, in many cases with much reality, of reverence, they tell us that the representations of Scripture upon all these subjects are largely romantic, legendary, mythical; are, indeed, parable, allegory—a kind of inspired *Shakespeare, Paradise Lost and Regained,* and *Pilgrim's Progress* all in one. They have, for the most part, assured us that this does not affect the great moral and redemptive teaching of the Bible. They say that the Bible was not given to the world to make known "judgments of fact," and that it does not do so with uniformity, but that its "value judgments" are impeccable.

These things have troubled many people. The archæologists have gone to the old home to see for themselves and for others, if these things be true or not. They have dug up the old hearthstones and have delved in the dust of forgotten ages of home life and national

events. They have inquired among neighborhood peoples and learned their folklore; have studied the institutions, and times and history, and have examined old archives. They have even exhumed the dead to read their names, learn their history, and discern their religious beliefs. They have especially noted the progress of events and the changes taking place at the points at which our old friend has introduced his most important lessons. They have found very many things exactly as the Book says. Many more things they have learned of which the Book says nothing. But what is of the most interest is that in all the wide scope of their investigations they have found nothing that discredits the Book as a narrator of facts. So they have come home to love and trust the Bible more than ever, because convinced that it is morally impossible for it to have dealt so loosely with facts and never get caught at it by the archæologists.

APPENDIX

NOTES OF REFERENCE

Chapter I

PAGE	NOTE	
2	1	Cf. Zenos, *The Elements of the Higher Criticism*, p. 9.
4	1	Petrie, *Methods and Aims of Archaeology*, p. viii.
4	2	*Ibid.*, p. 123.
5	1	De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hebraeisch-judaeischen Archaologie*, pp. 3–5; (p. 3) "Der Inhalt der hebraeischen Archaeologie ergiebt sich aus dem, was zum ganzen Zustande der hebraeischen Nation in ihrer geschichtlichen Erscheinung gehört." (p. 5) "Quellen. Denkmäler, Schriftliche Quellen I Classe Alttestament. Die erste und wichtigste Quelle ist das A. T. welches mit sehr vorsichtiger Unterscheidung des Alters der einzelnen Schriften und mit strenger Würdigung ihres historischen Characters zu benutzen ist."
5	2	*Catholic Encyc.* Art. *Bib. Antiq.* (Gabrielle Oussani).
5	3	*Jewish Encyc.* Art. *Bib. Arch.*
6	1	Cf. p. 60.
7	1	Cf. Zenos, *Elements of the Higher Criticism*, p. 9.

Chapter II

13	1	Wellhausen, *Hist. of Israel*, p. 12.
14	1	Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 143–150.
14	2	Driver, *Introduction*, '97, p. 4.
14	3	Driver, *Genesis, Addenda and Corrections.*
14	4	Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, p. 142.
14	5	Orr, *Problem of the Old Test.*, pp. 395–430.
15	1	Eerdmans, *Hibbert Journal*, 1909, pp. 813–826. Cf. *Alttestamentliche Studien.*
15	2	Wiener, *Bib. Sacra.*, 1908–1910.
15	3	Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, p. 47.
16	1	Brugsch, *Egypt Under the Pharaohs*, cf. chaps. v and vi.
16	2	Naville, *Store City of Pithom, Egypt. Ex. Fund*, 1883–84.
16	3	Naville, *Recueill de Travaux*, vol. xx, 1898, p. 32.
16	4	Petrie, *British School of Archaeology in Egypt*, 1906.

PAGE	NOTE	
17	1	Jer. *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, especially chaps. iv–xix.
17	2	Müller, *Asien und Europa*, especially chaps. x–xxv.
19	1	Kyle, *Bible Student and Teacher*, November, 1906, p. 366.

Chapter III

28	1	*Deut.*, xii, 2–3.
28	2	*I Kings*, xii, 31.
28	3	*Jer.*, iii, 6.
28	4	Vincent, *Canaan*, p. 144.
28	5	Macalister, *Pales. Ex. Fund. Statement*, 1903, pp. 23–31.
29	1	Robinson, *Biblical World*, January, 1901, January, 1908.

Chapter IV

32	1	Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 143.
36	1	Renouf, *Life-work*, i, pp. 6–7.
37	1	Budge, *The Mummy*, p. 124.
37	2	Cf. de Guines, *Le Chow-King*, Pref.; also *Essai Historique sur L'origine des Characters Orientaux.*
39	1	Petrie, *Abydos, Royal Tombs.*
39	2	Evans, *Quarterly Review*, October, 1904, pp. 374–395.
39	3	Schliemann, *Ilios, City and Country of the Trojans*, p. 13.
41	1	Cf. p. 13.
41	2	Wellhausen, *Hist. of Israel*, p. 12.
41	3	George Adam Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, pp. 107–108.
42	1	Napoleon, *Campagnes d'Egypte et de Syrie, dicteés par Napoleon lui même*, vol. ii. "En campant sur les ruines de ces anciennes villes, on lisait tous les soirs l'Ecriture Sainte a haute voix sous la tente du general en chef. L'analogie et la verite des descriptions etaient frappantes: elles conviennent encore a ce pays après tant de siècles et de vicissitudes."

Chapter V

47	1	Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 145.
47	2	Seiss, *Miracle in Stone*, p. 307.
49	1	George Adam Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, p. 108.
49	2	Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 148.
52	1	Kyle, *Bib. Sacra*, July, 1910, pp. 386–387.
52	2	Kautzsch, *Die bleibende Bedeutung des* p. 172.

PAGE	NOTE	
52	3	*Gen.*, x, 11–12.
55	1	*Gen.*, xv, 13–16; *Ex.*, xii, 40.
55	2	R. S. Poole, *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, art. "Genealogy."
57	1	Petrie, *Six Temples at Thebes*, pp. 26–28, pls. xiii–xiv.
57	2	Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, iii, pp. 156–157.
58	1	Kyle, *Bible Student*, January, 1902, pp. 33–36.
60	1	Napoleon, *Campagnes d'Egypt et de Syrie.*
60	2	Robinson, *Biblical Researches.*
60	3	Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine.*
60	4	Thompson, *The Land and the Book.*
60	5	Van Lennep, *Bible Lands.*
60	6	Palmer, *The Desert of the Exodus.*
60	7	Clermont Ganneau, *P.E.F., Archaeological Researches.*
60	8	Van Dyke, *Out of Doors in Palestine.*
62	1	Wiener, *Bib. Sacra*, 1908–1910.
62	2	Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs.*
62	3	Naville, *The Store City of Pithom*, also *Recueill de Travaux*, vol. xx, p. 32, 1898.
62	4	Petrie, *Hist. of Egypt; Hyksos and Israelite Cities; Tanis, Part II; Researches in Sinai and Egypt, and the Bible.*
62	5	Rawlinson, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*
62	6	Botta, *Monument de Ninive discouvert et decrit.*
62	7	Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains.*
62	8	Sayce, *Higher Criticism and the Monuments, Patriarchal Palestine.*
62	9	Vincent, *Canaan, d'Après l'Exploration Recent.*
62	10	Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands.*
62	11	Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel.*
62	12	Steindorf, In *Explorations in Bible Lands* (Hilprecht).

Chapter VI

65	1	Wright, *Scientific Confirmations*, pp. 234–235.
64	1	*Ibid.*, pp. 235–236.
66	2	*Ibid.*, p. 240.
66	3	*Ibid.*, p. 241.
66	4	*Ibid.*, p. 292.
67	1	*Ibid.*, p. 292.
67	2	*Ibid.*, p. 303.
67	3	*Ibid.*, p. 321.
67	4	*Ibid.*, p. 322.
67	5	*Ibid.*, p. 144; also Blanckenkorn, *Z.D.P.V.*, xix, p. 1.
68	1	Wright, *Scientific Confirmations*, p. 146.

PAGE NOTE

69 2 *Gen.*, xii, 10–20; xiii, 1; xli, 14–46; xlvii, 1–12.
71 1 Barton, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xxviii, part ii, 1909, pp. 165–166.
71 2 H. P. Smith, *Old Test. Hist.*, pp. 35–51.
71 3 Wellhausen, *Hist. of Israel*, pp. 318–319. Cf. Orr, *Problem of the Old Test.*, p. 57.
71 4 Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, p. 102.
72 1 *Ibid.*, chaps. v–vi.
72 2 Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities.*
73 1 *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 10, pl. ix.
73 2 *Ibid.*, pp. 5–9, pls. ii, iii, iv.
73 3 Kyle, *Recueill de Travaux*, xxx, *Geographic and Ethnic Lists of Rameses II.*
73 4 Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 2tes Kapitel.
73 5 Kyle, Cf. *Bib. Sacra*, July, 1910, pp. 374–375.

Chapter VII

76 1 Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, ch. viii.
76 2 *Gen.*, xiv, 13.
76 3 *Ibid.*, 14.
77 1 *Heb.* vii, 3.
77 2 Greenfield, *Comprehensive Com., Gen.*, xiv, 18–19.
77 3 Meyer, *Commentary on Hebrews*, vii, 3.
77 4 *Ibid.* (American editor).
78 1 Marcus Dodds, *Gen.*, pp. 128–130.
78 2 Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, iv, pp. 231–235.
79 1 Cf. pp. 54–58.

Chapter VIII

81 1 Driver, *Genesis, Addenda*, p. xx.
82 1 Peake, *The Present Movement of Biblical Science* (in Inaugural Lectures by Members of the Faculty of Theology of Manchester University, p. 31).
83 1 Von Bohlen, *Gen.* (Eng.), pp. 29–41.
83 2 Reuss, *Geschichte der Schriften alten Testaments*, p. 96. "Ja, und dies gehört unmittelbar an diese Stelle unseres Berichtes, lässt sich mit Fug and Recht fragen, ob von Schreibkunst bei den Israeliten, und von den andern dazu gehörigen Künsten, in dem hier vorauszusetzenden Umfang die Rede sein könne zu Mose's Zeit. Lasse man diesen immerhin nach der Sage in ägyptischer Weisheit

PAGE NOTE

unterrichtet sein, die kananäitische Schrift, deren sich die Hebräer bedienten so weit die Geschichte reicht, war dort eine fremde. Soll er dieselbe wohl gar erfunden haben? Zudem screibt Niemand ganze Bücher als für Menchen die lesen können und wircklich lesen. Es sollen indessen diese Bedenken nicht als durchaus entcheidende aufgestellt sein. Mag die Vorstellung von weit verbreiteter altsemitischer Cultur sich rechtfertigen, die eigene Beschaffenheit der Gesetze und ihre Sammlung gibt den Ausschlag bei der Frage nach ihrem Ursprunge."

84 1 Dillmann, *Num., Deut. u. Josh.*, pp. 594–595. "Aber auch der gesetzliche Theil des Pentateuchs kann nicht von Mose, sei er geschrieben, sei er mündlich verkündigt u. durch andere aufgeschrieben, sein (s. meine Ausführung in Schenkel's BL. II. 439 ff.) Abgesehen davon, dass eine so ausgedehnte Schriftstellerei in den Anfängen des Volkes Isr. nicht annehmbar ist u. viel mehr auf eine Zeit hinweist, in welcher Schreibe- u. Lesekunst viel verbreitet war, zeigen sich im gesetzlichen, wie im erzählenden Theil so viele Wiederholungen, Abweichungen (sogar im Hauptdekalog zwichen E. 20u.D.5) u. Widersprüche der gesetzl. Bestimmungen, auch so grosse formale oder redactionelle Verschiedenheiten (von der knappsten, bündigsten Fassung bis zur ausführlichsten, über die casuistischen Einzelheiten sich verbreitenden Darstellung), zugleich eine Reihe von sachlich u. sprachlich zusammengehörenden und wieder von anderen sich unterscheidenden Buchschichten, dass schon um deswillen an einheitlichen Ursprung dieser ganzen Gesetzesschrift nicht zu denken ist."

84 2 Driver, *Gen.*, pp. xlii-xliii.

85 1 Orr, *Problem of the Old Test.*, p. 375.

86 1 Sayce, *Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, p. 143; also Heutzy *Revue d'Assyriologie*, 1897, pp. 1–17.

86 2 Rodgers, *Hist. of Bab. and Assyr.*, i, p. 366 (some would reduce this by 1000 years).

87 1 Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, iv, pp. 184–241; Conder, *The Tell Amarna Tablets.*

89 1 Orr, *Problem of the Old Test.*, p. 60.

89 2 Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, i, pp. 108–109.

90 1 George Adam Smith, *Expositor*, 1908, pp. 254–272.

PAGE	NOTE	
90	2	Sellin, *Tel Taannek.*
91	1	Macalister, *P.E.F.S.;* Vincent, *Canaan,* chap. 1.
91	2	Vincent, *P.E.F.S.*, 1908, p. 223, also, Macalister, *P.E.F.S.*, 1908, pp. 96–108.
91	3	Petrie, *Deshasha; Egypt. Explo. Fund,* pl. iv.
91	4	*Deut.*, i, 28.
92	1	Birch, *Records of the Past,* 1st series, ii, pp. 35–52. Lepsius, *Denkmäler,* Abth. iii, 32, 32A, 30A, 30B; Auswahl iii, 442–445; Sayce, *Archaeology and the Cuneiform Inscriptions,* pp. 156–7.
95	1	Kuenen, *Religion of Israel,* i, p. 225.
97	1	George Adam Smith, *P.E.F.S.*, pp. 287–288.
98	1	Fripp, *Composition of Genesis,* Intro., p. v.
98	2	Robertson, *Early Religion,* p. 30.
99	1	De Wette, *Int.*, ii, p. 71, Parker's note.
99	2	Von Bohlen, *Gen.*, p. 91.
99	3	Müller, *Asien und Europa,* p. 136.
99	4	Chabas, *Records of the Past,* new series, vol. ii, pp. 18–36.
99	5	Kyle, *Receuill de Travaux,* xxx, *Geographic and Ethnic Lists of Rameses II.*

Chapter IX

102	1	Schultz, *Old Test. Theology,* i, p. 31.
102	2	Cf. Jeremias, *Das Alte. Test. im Lichte des alten Orients;* Hommel, *Heb. Tradition,* ch. v; Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel,* ch. vi; Barton, *Journal Bib. Lit.*, 1909. vol. xxviii, part ii; Kittel, *Scientific Study of Old Test.*
102	3	Cf. pp. 126–134.
103	1	Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen,* pp. 156–171.
103	2	Wellhausen, *Comp. des Hex.*, pp. 311–312. Nöldeke's Kritik (*Gen.*, xiv) ist unerschüttert und unumstösslich. Dass zur Zeit Abraham's vier Könige vom persischen Meerbusen her eine Razzia bis in die Halbinsel des Sinai machen, das sie bei der Gelegenheit fünf Stadt-fürsten welche im [am] toten Meere hausen überfallen und gefangen fortschleppen: das endlich Abraham mit 318 Knechten den abziehenden Siegern nachsetzt und ihnen den Raub abjagt—das sind einfach Unmöglichkeiten. Sie werden dadurch zutrauenswürdiger dass sie mit grosser Geflissentlichkeit in eine untergangene Welt placirt werden."

PAGE NOTE

104 1 Delitzsch, *Gen.* xiv. "Hitzig . . . . . sieht in dem Feldzuge Kedorlaormers, der in ein 14tes Jahr fällt, eine in die Vorzeit zurückgeworfene Abschattung von 2 K. 18, 13 und erklärt das c. 14 im Allgem. für jüngere Sage, welche seit Salem durch die Anwesenheit Jave's geheiligt war, sich zu vorliegenden Gestalt ausbilden könnte . . . . . Ed. Meyer urteilt ebenso, nur dass er sich viel geringschätziger ausdrückt . . . . .

Die neue Pentateuchkritik, die von Reuss ihre ersten Impulse empfangen, betrachtet c. 14 als eins der jüngsten, erst in die letzte Ausgabe der Genesis eingeschriebenen Stücke, auf welche sich das von Melchisedek gesagte Wort *ápátor ámētor ágenealogitos* anwenden lasse . . . . . und Ed. Meyer zieht daraus weiter die Folgerung, dass die Einzelheiten der Erzählung vollständig unhistorisch seien."

104 2 Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, p. 551. "Über diese Ausdehnung der Elamitenmacht haben wir noch aus einer gantz anderen Quelle Kunde. In dem Pentateuch ist Gen. 14 eine Erzählung eingelegt, die keiner der sonst benutzten Quellenschriften angehört, sondern offenbar aus einem, sonst verschollenen, volkstümlichen Legendenbuch aufgenommen ist (ähnlich wie z. B. Jud. 19–21). Nach Sprache und Inhalt kann sie erst in oder nach dem Babylonischen Exil verfasst sein . . . . Dass das späte Phantasie ohne jeden geschichlichten Inhalt ist, bedarf keiner Ausführung."

105 1 Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, p. 224. "In der gesammten Erzählung vom Gericht über Sodom und Gomorrha, wie sie vorliegt, klingen die Motive einer Feuerflut an, die die Geschichte zum Gegenstück der Sintflut machen.

1. Das Verderben kommt über Sodom und Gomorrha, das einst dem Paradise glich (13:10, "gleich Ägyptenland" ist Glosse) un des Frevels der Menschen willen.

2. Ein Gerechter wird mit seiner Familie gerettet, wie Noah bei der Sintflut selbacht.

3. Als Rettungsort wird ein Berg angewiesen, 19, 17; in Wirklichkeit ist der Rettungsort die Stadt Zoar.

4. Der für die Rettung Ausersehene wird verlacht. I Moses 14, 14.

5. Dem richtenden Gotte wird vorgehalten, dass er nur die Frevler mit dem Gerichte treffen sollte, 18, 25."

PAGE NOTE

105 2 Barton, *Journal of Bib. Lit.*, 1909, vol. xxviii, pt. ii, pp. 159–160.

106 1 Hommel, *Ancient Heb. Tradition*, chap. v; Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, chaps. vi–vii; Cf. also Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orient*, kap xv.

106 2 Hommel, *Ancient Heb. Tradition*, pp. 190–191.

107 1 Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, pp. 126–127.

108 1 Goodwin, *Records of the Past*, 2d series, iv, p. 25.

108 2 Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, v, p. 7; Barton, *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, 1909, vol. xxviii, pt. ii, pp. 160–161 (earlier mention is unknown).

108 3 Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, iv, p. 166; *Ibid.*, vi, pp. 40; 136, 188; Conder, *Tell. Amarna Tablets.*

108 4 Sayce, *Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, p. 169 cf.

108 5 Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, iv, p. 186.

108 6 *Ibid.*, vi, p. 34.

109 1 Winckler, *O.L.Z.*, 1906, December 15.

110 1 Driver, *Genesis*, *Addenda* to Seventh Edition, xxxv-xxxvi.

110 2 Cf. pp. 126–134.

111 1 Gunkel, *Genesis* (*Nowack, Handkommentar*), pp. 262–263. "Die Erzählung enthält also im schreienden Contrast gut Beglaubigtes und ganz Unmögliches."

112 1 Ladd, *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, p. 98.

113 1 Cf. p. 47.

Chapter X

115 1 Barton, *A Sketch of Semitic Origins*, pp. 28–29.

116 1 Orr, *Problem of the Old Test.*, pp. 396–397.

116 2 Clay, *Amurru.*

117 1 *Ibid.*, p. 13.

118 1 Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, p. 90.

118 2 Clay, *The Empire of the Amorites.*

121 1 Kyle, *Bib. Sac.*, July, 1910, p. 377.

122 1 Macalister, *P.E.F.S.*, 1903–1905.

123 1 Petrie, *Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity*, p. 89.

123 2 *Ibid.*, p. 94.

123 3 *Ibid.*, p. 94.

123 4 *Ibid.*, p. 93.

124 1 *Ibid.*, p. 40.

124 2 *Ibid.*, p. 168.

126 1 Moulton, *Theological Lectures, Manchester University Volume*, p. 172.

PAGE NOTE

Chapter XI

128 1 Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 145.
129 1 Cf. chap. iv.
130 1 Driver, *Addenda* to Seventh Edition of *Genesis*, p. xxxiv.
131 1 *Ibid.*, p. xxxv.
132 1 Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 156–157.
133 2 *Ibid.*, p. 163.
133 3 *Ibid.*, p. 165.
133 4 *Ibid.*, p. 168
134 1 *Ibid.*, pp. 170–171.
136 1 Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, p. 131.
136 2 *Ibid.*, p. 137.
136 3 Sayce, *Homiletic Review*, 1911, January, p. 7.
138 2 König, *Homiletic Review*, 1911, July, p. 30.
139 1 Barton, *Journal Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, part ii, 1909.
139 2 Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities.*
139 3 Cf. p. 233–234.
140 1 Kyle, *Moses and the Monuments*, pp. 34–38.
140 2 Cf. p. 135.
140 3 Driver, *Addenda* to Seventh Edition of *Genesis*, p. xx.
141 1 Breasted, *A History of Egypt*, p. 530. Cf. *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, 1904, pp. 22–36.
141 2 Spiegelberg, *Egyptologische Randglossen*, 1904, p. 14. Breasted, *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, 1904, pp. 22–36; also *Ancient Records*, 1906, pp. 352–355; Kyle, *Jour. American Oriental Society*, vol. xxxi, part i, 1910, p. 86, with reply by Breasted; *ibid.*, vol. xxxi, part iii, 1911, p. 290f.
141 3 Cf. Kittel, *Scientific Study of the Old Test.*; also *Bib. Sacra*, April, 1911, p. 249.
142 1 Smith-Eerdmans, *Expositor*, 1908 (July-December), pp. 118–131, 254–272, 345–358.

Chapter XII

143 1 Winckler, *Orientalische Forschungen*, series i, pp. 24–41. p. 40. "Was wir von wircklichen geschichtlichen erinnerungen des volkes Israel aus seiner vorkananäischern zeit wissen, weist auf einen aufenthalt in Musri hin. Wäre es nun undenkbar, dass der kern der sage von dem ägyptischen aufenthalte nichts wäre als diese eine tat-

PAGE NOTE

sache und dass alle anderen angaben nur der verwechslung der beiden namen Musri und Misraim ihren ursprung verdanken?"

144 1 Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, p. 160.
144 2 Macalister, *P.E.F.S.*, 1903, p. 309.
146 1 Ex. chaps. xx-xxviii.
146 2 Budde, *Religion of Israel*, p. 59.
150 1 Zimmern, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament.*
150 2 Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients.*
150 3 Jensen, *Das Gilgamisch-Epos in der Welt-literatur.*
150 4 Barton, *Bib. World*, 1908, new series, vol. xxxi, pp. 433–444.
151 1 Clay, *Amurru*, pp. 15–16. Cf. Barton, *Biblical World*, 1908, p. 436.
152 1 Clay, *Amurru*, p. 17.
152 2 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
155 1 Cf. p. 80ff.
158 1 Cf. *United Presbyterian*, June, 1906.
162 1 George Adam Smith, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Test.*, pp. 62–64.
162 2 Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 152.
163 3 Kyle, *Moses and the Monuments*, pp. 34–38; Lieblein, *Dictionaire de noms*, 55.
168 1 *Prov.*, vii, 16.
172 1 Kyle, *Moses and the Monuments* and *The Problem of the Pentateuch.*

Chapter XIII

175 1 Orr, *Problem of the Old Test.*, pp. 85–88.
181 1 Hogg, *Inaugural Lectures by Members of the Faculty of Theology of Manchester University*, 1905, p. 65ff.
188 1 Kyle, *Moses and the Monuments*, pp. 149–160.

Chapter XVI

230 1 Green, *Unity of Genesis.*
232 1 *Gen.*, x, 8–10.
232 2 Clay, *Light on the Old Test., from Babel*, pp. 89–92; Sayce, *Arch. of Cuneiform Inscriptions*, chap. iii.
232 3 *Guide to Bab. and Assyr. Antiq. British Museum*, pl. xxxiii.
234 1 Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, vol. 1, chap. 1.
235 1 *Isaiah*, xix, 18.
235 2 Macalister, *Bible Side Lights of Gezer*, chap. ii.

PAGE	NOTE	
235	3	Cf. pp. 52–53.
235	4	*Job*, i, 3.
235	5	*Num.*, xxiii, 7.
235	6	*Matt.*, ii, 1.
235	7	Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine*, pp. 205–206.

Chapter XVII

237	1	Cf. pp. 112–115.
237	2	Cf. chaps. viii–ix.
238	1	Sayce, *Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, pp. 139–141.
238	2	*Ibid.*, p. 143.
238	3	Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, p. 127; Hommel, *Patriarchal Palestine*, p. 192.
238	4	Cf. Barton, *Journal of Bib. Lit.*, xxviii, II, 1909.
239	1	King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi.*
239	2	Clay, *Light on Old Test. from Babel*, p. 131f.
239	3	Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine*, p. 70.
239	4	Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, pp. 131–136.
240	1	Driver, *Addenda* to *Genesis* (seventh edition), pp. xxxiv-xxxvi.
242	1	*Gen.*, xiv, 4.
242	2	Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, pp. 290f.; Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine*, p. 175.
242	3	*Vide* translations by Winckler, Johns and Harper.
242	4	Lyon, *Journal American Oriental Society*, vol. xxv, p. 254

Chapter XVIII

246	1	Cf. p. 84.
247	1	Sellin, *Tel Taannek.*
247	2	Macalister, *P.E.F.S.*, 1902–1909.
247	3	Cf. p. 90.
247	4	Conder, *The Tell Amarna Tablets.*
251	1	Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, chap. v.
251	2	*Ibid.*, chap. vi.
252	1	Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*, chaps. i, ii.
252	2	*Gen.*, xli, 25–40.
252	3	Cf. pp. 67–68.
253	1	*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1924.
254	1	*Ezek.*, xvi, 56–59.
256	1	Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, pp. 61–62, 1904, pl. 106.
256	2	Herodotus, Book, II, chap. 37.

Chapter XIX

PAGE	NOTE	
259	1	Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 135.
261	1	George Adam Smith, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Test.*, pp. 63–64; Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 52.
261	2	Driver, art. "Joseph," *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Hastings.
262	1	Lieblein, *Proc. Soc. Bib. Arch.*, 1898, pp. 204–208.
263	1	Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, pp. 121–123.
264	1	Baedeker, *Egypt, Tombs of Beni hasan*; cf. Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, p. 19, pls. 8–11.
265	1	Cf. p. 223 references.
265	2	Josephus, *Against Apion*, i, 14.
265	3	Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*, pp. 8–14; Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine*, p. 124.
266	1	*Judges*, v, 17; *I Chron.*, vii, 21–22; Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 236.
266	2	*Gen.*, 1.
269	1	Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, v, p. 126.
270	1	*Ibid.*, p. 123; Naville, *Pithom, Egypt. Ex. Fund*, vol. i.
274	1	Kyle, *Moses and the Monuments*, pp. 14–18.
274	2	Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 135.
275	1	Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, art. "Moses."
275	2	Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, iii, pp. 156–157.

Chapter XX

279	1	*Ex.*, xiv, 22, 29.
279	2	*Ex.*, xiv, 25.
281	1	*Bible Student*, 1902, January, p. 29.
283	1	*I Kings*, 9: 16.
283	2	Petrie, *Six Temples at Thebes*, p. 28; pls. xiii-xiv; Naville, *Recueill de Travaux*, vol. xx, p. 32, 1898.
283	3	Merrins, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, pp. 401–429, 611-635, 1908.
284	1	Spiegelberg, *Six Temples at Thebes* (Petrie), p. 28.
285	1	Conder, *Tell Amarna Tablets*.
285	2	*United Presbyterian*, July 5, 1906.
286	1	Green, *Unity of Genesis*, p. 499.
289	1	*Ps.*, xvi, 9–11; xvii, 15.
289	2	*Job*, xix, 26.
289	3	*Isa.*, xxvi, 19.
289	4	*Ezek.*, xxvii.
289	5	*Dan.*, xii, 2.

PAGE	NOTE	
289	6	Petrie, *Religion of Ancient Egypt*, p. 17; cf. Wiedemann, *Ancient Egyptian Doctrine of Immortality;* also Maspero, *Guide to Cairo Museum.*
290	1	Kyle, *Moses and the Monuments*, Lecture V.
291	1	Kyle, *Moses and the Monuments*, Lectures I and II.

Chapter XXI

300	1	*Deut.*, vi, 10–11; *Josh.*, xxiv, 13; *Neh.*, ix, 25.
300	2	*Ezek.*, xvi, 44–46; *Deut.*, vii, 3.
300	3	*Judges*, i.
301	1	*II Kings*, xvii, 1–7.
302	2	Macalister, *P.E.F.S.*, 1903, pp. 8–9, 49.
302	3	Cf. pp. 93–97.
310	1	*Judges*, i, 29.
310	2	*I Kings*, xix, 16.
310	3	Cf. pp. 140–142
311	2	*I Kings*, xii, 12–16.
311	3	Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, pp. 51–54, pls. 75–87.
312	1	Caldecott, *Solomon's Temple*, pp. 77–78.
312	2	Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, pl. 81, nos. 71–72.
312	3	Driver, *Addenda* to Seventh Eddition of *Genesis*, p. xx; Barton, *Journal Bib. Lit.*, vol. xxviii, part ii, 1909.
312	4	Cf. pp. 136–138.
313	1	*Isa.*, xxxvi-xxxvii; Price, *Monuments and the Old Test.*, pp. 181–183.
313	2	Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, vi, pp. 149–150.
315	1	*Jer.*, xliii, 5–7.
315	2	Petrie, *Tell Defenneh, Egypt. Ex. Fund*, iv, chap. vii.
315	3	Naville, *Pithom., Egypt Ex. Fund*, i.
316	1	*I Sam.*, xiii.
316	2	*Ibid.*, xiii, 19.
316	3	Vincent, *Canaan*, pp. 236–459ff, 464.
316	4	Price, *The Monuments and the Old Test.*, pp. 144–146.
317	1	*Ibid.*, pp. 144–147.
318	1	*Ibid.*, p. 154 (pls. opposite p. 292).
321	2	Cf. pp. 270–271.
321	3	*II Kings*, xxii and xxiii, 1–30.
321	4	*II Chron.*, xxxv, 20–24.
322	1	*Ibid.*, xxxvi, 1–4.

PAGE	NOTE	
322	2	*Ibid.*, 5–21.
323	1	Cf. Rawlinson and Layard.
323	2	Berosus, quoted by Sayce, *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 488.
324	1	Wiener, *Archaeology and Prophecy.*
324	2	Cf. pp. 272–273.
325	1	*Isa.*, xl. 3–5.
325	2	*Ibid.*, xliii, 2.
326	1	*Ibid.*, xliii, 16–21.
326	2	*Ibid.*, xlvi, 1–2.
327	1	Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, p. 375.
330	1	*Guide to Bab. and Assyr. Antiquities, Brit. Mus.*, p. 195; Price, *Monuments and the Old Test.*, p. 241.
330	2	*II Kings*, ii, 12.
331	1	Wilson, *Did Daniel Write Daniel?* pp. 28–32.
332	1	Clay, *Light on the Old Test. from Babel*, pp. 374–375; Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 124–125.
332	3	Wilson, *Did Daniel Write Daniel?* p. 56.
333	1	Cf. Orr, *Problem of Old Test.*, p. 534.
333	2	Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, 1904, p. 16, pls. 5–7; also p. 9.

SUBJECT INDEX

Abraham,
the pilgrim, p. 75;
the first pilgrim father, p. 248;
familiar pathetic figure, p. 76;
such picture of A. discredited, p. 76;
called a mythological person, p. 150;
esteemed unhistorical by Nöldeke, p. 130;
conduct toward Sarah and Hagar, p. 243;
"Field of Abram," p. 140, 312.
Abydos,
Petrie's excavations at, p. 39.
Anachronisms,
Fripp concerning, p. 97;
Robertson concerning, p. 98;
Von Bohlen concerning, p. 99.
Analysis,
of the subject of this book, p. 7.
Archaeology,
definition, p. 3;
comprehensiveness, p. 4;
the biblical field, p. 5;
function in criticism, pp. 11–42;
function of service, pp. 17–29;
Function of control, pp. 30–42;
function among encyclopaedists, p. 11;
function among critics, p. 13;
function of archaeologists, p. 15;
provides way out of difficulties of the Higher Criticism, p. 1;
value of archaeological evidence, pp. 11–42, 221ff;
adequacy of archaeological evidence, pp. 110, 221ff;
confirms the imagery of the Bible, p. 58;
confirms the accuracy of Bible p. 61;
"assured results" of, pp. 221, 300;
Archaeology—Continued
archaeological book of Joshua, p. 119;
archaeological value of the ancient world, p. 335;
does not sustain mythological view of Israel's religion, pp. 101-112, 153-154;
archaeological evidence for unity of Isaiah, p. 324;
does not confirm "P." document, p. 302;
archaeological evidence concerning Patriarchs, pp. 124-137, 138-142;
sustains patriarchal reception in Egypt, pp. 69–74.
Ashur,
early return to Palestine, p. 266.
Assyria,
civilization of, p. 234;
relations with Israel, p. 319;
Assyro-Babylonian power, p. 319;
Greeks in A., pp. 330–333.
Astral Myths,
character of the theory, pp. 150–154;
in the origin of Israel's religion, 149–154;
Patriarchs in astral myths, p. 150.
Babylonia,
Babylonian origins in criticism, p. 115;
Professor Barton concerning criticism, p. 115;
Professor Orr concerning criticism, p. 115;
Professor Clay concerning criticism, p. 116;
Professor Rodgers concerning criticism, p. 117;
Babylonian influence in Canaan, p. 237-245;

Babylonia—Continued
beginnings of civilization in B., p. 232;
influence in days of Patriarchs, p. 86;
relations with Israel, p. 322;
Assyro-Babylonian power, p. 322;
Nabonidus at the taking of B., p. 331.
Belshazzar,
in the life and book of Daniel, p. 329;
relations with Israel, p. 330.
Bene Hassan,
tombs of, p. 264.
Bible,
unity and trustworthiness of, pp. 45–62, 119–122, 337–339;
face value of the Bible, p. 335;
presuppositions of the Bible, p. 175;
Biblical Chronology a real system, pp. 54–58;
character of biblical chronology, p. 80;
old system of biblical chronology passing away, p. 78;
indefiniteness of biblical chronology, p. 55;
synchronistic chronology, pp. 57, 78–80;
Egyptian chronology similar to biblical, p. 56.
Biblical Criticism,
founders of, p. 149;
new system of, p. 149;
literature of, p. 150;
"assured results" of, p. 222;
new facts for, p. 40;
history of archaeology in, pp. 7, 46–173;
cf. under Criticism.
Canaan,
beginnings of civilization of, p. 234;
Babylonian influence in, pp. 85–87;
condition of culture in C., at conquest, p. 120.
Canons,
guidance concerning, p. 21;
literary cannons must be learned from each age, p. 22;
of Research pp. 189–213.
Carchemish,
Waterloo of Egypt, p. 314.
Chaedorlaomer,
rela ions with the Patriarchs, pp. 129, 239.
Chronology,
handmaid of history, p. 223;
importance of C., p. 223;
mystery of Oriental C., p. 54;
indefiniteness of biblical C., p. 55;
ignorance on our part, p. 55;
character of biblical C., p. 78;
Biblical C. not rigidly mathematical pp. 54, 78, 224;
moral elements in, p. 79;
Biblical C. a real system, p. 54;
Egyptian C. similar to biblical, p. 56;
old assumed biblical system passing away, p. 78;
Biblical C., synchronistic, p. 58.
Circumcision,
Introduction into Israel, p. 55.
Cities of the Plain,
geological theory of destruction of, p. 68;
Professor Emerson concerning, p. 68;
region of, p. 254;
account of destruction esteemed unhistorical by Nöldeke, p. 130;
revelation concerning destruction of, p. 69.
Xenia Seminary 67.
Civilization,
dawn of civilization, p. 231;
rise of civilizations, p. 231;
Semitic, p. 232;
Hamitic, p. 232;
Japhetic, p. 232;
mingling of early civilizations, p. 117;
Babylonian, p. 232;
Assyrian, p. 234;
Egyptian, p. 234;

CIVILIZATION—Continued
Canaanite, p. 235;
European, p. 235;
C. of Palestine at conquest, p. 120;
C. always has manifestations, p. 145.
CODES,
the laws of the Pentateuch a C., p. 148;
code of Hammurabi, pp. 87, 148, 242–245;
code of Hammurabi in Palestine, pp. 87, 242–245.
COMMANDMENTS,
thought by some originally ten words, p. 146;
Budde concerning, p. 146;
compared with Precepts of Ptah Hotep, p. 197.
CONQUEST,
was there a conquest?, p. 299;
Moral descent at C., p. 303;
mingling of civilizations in times of, p. 120;
culture in Palestine in times of, p. 120.
CRITICISM,
definition, p. 6;
the Higher Criticism, p. 6;
the Higher Criticism a circumscribed enquiry, p. 1;
limited in discussion here, p. 6;
attitude toward, p. 6;
motif of current C., p. 88;
reconstructive criticism, pp. 127, 334–336;
guidance of methods of, pp. 20–29;
Babylonian origins in, pp. 115–119;
critical crutches, p. 171;
progress of testing of critical theories, pp. 78, 221–339.
CULTURE,
culture of Palestine at conquest, p. 120;
course of Semitic C., p. 237.
DANIEL,
life and book of, pp. 329–336;
different views concerning, p. 329;
DANIEL—Continued
relations with Belshazzar, p. 330;
Darius and Daniel, p. 332;
Greek words in the book of, p. 333.
DARIUS,
Darius and Daniel, p. 332.
DISPERSION,
first and second dispersions, pp. 115, 230–231.
EDEN,
location, pp. 63, 230;
evidence concerning, 63.
EDOM,
identified, p. 99;
Edomites on the border of Egypt, p. 275.
EGYPT,
Egyptian civilization, p. 234;
relations with Israel, pp. 309–316;
relations with Nebuchadnezzar, pp. 315, 322;
proper names in E., pp. 160–173;
Semitic language in E., p. 251;
coming of Asiatics into E., p. 251;
Edomites on the border of E., p. 274;
Phoenicians in E., p. 72;
Greeks in E., p. 333;
descent into E., and sojourn there, pp. 250–252;
reception accorded Patriarchs in E., pp. 315, 322;
Hebrew slavery in E., p. 267;
Moses in E., p. 275;
account of Moses fits into Egyptian history, p. 276;
exodus from E., 277;
Egyptian evidences of Mosaic age of Pentateuch, pp. 284–294;
Egyptian evidence against late authorship of Pentateuch, pp. 284–294;
Egyptian words in Pentateuch pp. 291, 160–172;
Jeremiah in E., p. 315;
Carchemish Waterloo of E., p. 315;

Egypt—Continued
the "Desert Egypt," pp. 143–145, 277;
Winckler concerning "Desert E." p. 143;
Cheney concerning "Desert E.," p. 144;
"Desert E." not sustained by archaeological research, p. 144;
evidence from Gezer concerning, "Desert E." p. 145.
Ethnology,
handmaid of history, p. 224;
comparative importance of, p. 224.
Evidence,
possibilities of fragmentary, p. 229;
value of archaeological, pp. 226–230;
adequacy of archaeological, pp. 110, 229;
ignoring E. a source of fallacies, p. 180;
archaeological evidence on mythological theory, pp. 105–112;
Egyptian E. against late authorship of Pentateuch, pp. 154–174;
Egyptian E. for Mosaic age of Pentateuch, pp. 284–294;
Evolution,
limits of application, p. 88;
processes of, p. 119–120;
"prevision" in, p. 122;
evolution in reconstructive theory, p. 334–336.
Exodus,
exodus from Egypt, pp. 277–280;
condition of Palestine at time of E., p. 295.
Facts
facts to test theories, p. 30;
source of new facts with which to test biblical criticism, p. 40.
Fallacies,
source of differences among scholars, p. 174;
Fallacies—Continued
introduced by presuppositions, p. 175;
deduction without comparison, p. 177;
seeking after discord, p. 178;
ignoring evidence, p. 180;
unscientific speculation, p. 182;
fallacious arguments for late authorship of Pentateuch, pp. 154–172.
Flood,
geological theory of, p. 63;
Professor Salisbury concerning the flood, p. 63;
Professor Wright concerning the flood, p. 65;
dispersion after the flood, pp. 230.
Function,
function of archaeology in criticism, pp. 7, 11-42;
only recently given much attention, pp. 11-17;
function of service, pp. 17-28;
function of control, pp. 30–42;
function in encyclopaedias, p. 11;
function among critics, p. 13;
function among archaeologists p. 15.
Genealogical Lists,
of Israel, p. 297.
Geography,
importance of, p. 223;
handmaid of history, p. 223;
geographical correctness of Scripture, pp. 48–54.
Geology,
geological theory of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain, p. 68;
Professor Emerson concerning, p. 68;
geological theory of the flood, pp. 64–68;
Professor Salisbury concerning, p. 64;
Professor Wright concerning, p. 65.

GEZER,
evidence concerning "Desert Egypt" from G., p. 143;
history in layers at, p. 121;
High Place encroached upon at G., p. 121;
GOMMORRAH,
cf. Cities of the Plain.
GREEK,
Greeks in Egypt, p. 333;
Greeks in Syria, p. 333;
Greek words in Daniel, pp. 329–333;
New Testament Greek, p. 125;
Deissmann concerning N. T. Greek, p. 126.
HAMITIC,
Hamitic civilization, p. 232;
HAMMURABI,
among the four kings, p. 238;
code of, pp. 87; 149; 242–245;
code of in Palestine, p. 87, 242-245.
HEBREW,
Hebrew literature, p. 177;
Hebrew slavery in Egypt, p. 267–274;
account of Hebrew slavery not to be expected in Egypt, p. 273.
HERMETIC WRITINGS,
post-christian view of, pp. 123–125;
character of, pp. 123–125;
recent examination by Professor Petrie, p. 123;
date of, p. 123.
HIGH PLACES,
discovery of, p. 28;
described, p. 28;
encroached upon at Gezer, p. 121;
interpretation of, p. 28.
HIGHER CRITICISM,
name, p. 6.
a circumscribed inquiry, pp. 1–3;
archaeology provides way out, p. 2.
HISTORY
importance of historical study of Scripture, p. 18;
HISTORY—Continued
handmaids of H., pp. 223–225;
geography a handmaid of history, p. 223;
chronology a handmaid of history, p. 223–225;
ethnology a handmaid of history, p. 224;
one solution in problems of history, p. 34;
historical enquiry concerning Bible quite legitimate, p. 111;
ignorance of history of archaeology in criticism, p. 45;
scope of such history, p. 49;
beginnings of, pp. 221–236;
biblical history, five periods, p. 222;
investigation of history in layers, pp. 227–231;
Israel's history and God's providence, p. 295;
interpretation of literature aided by historical enquiry, p. 26;
history of Cities of Plain esteemed unhistorical by Nöldeke, p. 127;
some items of H. added at a later date in Pentateuch, p. 156;
prophetic history and literature, pp. 322–336.
HISTORICAL SETTING,
of Scripture, pp. 11–19;
importance of p. 18;
supplied by archaeology, p. 19.
HISTORICITY,
Ladd concerning Historicity of Scripture, p. 111.
HIEROGLYPHS,
Hittite, p. 37;
interpretation of p. 37;
HITTITES,
accused as mythological, pp. 108–109;
vindicated, p. 109;
Winckler concerning, p. 109;
Budge concerning, p. 108;
Hittite hieroglyphs, p. 37.
HYKSOS,
meaning of name, p. 72;

Hyksos—Continued
rise of, p. 72;
relations between H. and Patriarchs, pp. 69–73;
reception accorded to Patriarchs by H., p. 70;
knowledge of true God among; p. 72;
at Tell el-Yehudiyeh, p. 72.
Imagery,
correctness of Bible imagery, pp. 58–62;
universal working assumption of such correctness, p. 58;
far-reaching in importance, p. 58;
confirmed by archaeology, p. 59.
Isaac,
story of, p. 257.
Isaiah,
unity of, pp. 324–327;
argument against unity, pp. 325–329;
archaeological evidence for, pp. 325–327.
Israel,
Israel's history in relation to God's providence, p. 253;
Israel's career, national period, pp. 285–336;
Philistines on Israel's horizon, p. 316;
Israel at the Red Sea, p. 277;
Israel and Shishak, p. 311;
Israel and Sennacherib, p. 313;
Israel and Tirhaka, p. 314;
relations with Assyria, p. 320;
relations with Babylonia, p. 322;
relations with Nebuchadnezzar, pp. 314–322;
relations with Necho, p. 314;
Palestinian origin of Israel's culture, pp. 93–97;
the oppressor of Israel, p. 267;
religion of Israel, p. 149;
astral myths claimed in, pp. 149–154;
leaders of Israel as myths, pp. 149–152;
preposterous and blasphemous
Israel—Continued
character of mythical theory, p. 152.
Jacob,
obsequies of, p. 266;
Jacob scarabs, p. 266;
Japhetic,
Japhetic civilization, p. 232.
Jehu,
put to tribute by Shalmaneser, 321.
Jeremiah,
carried into Egypt, p. 316;
at Tahpanhes, p. 316;
Job; Theory of incompleteness of the book; p. 173.
Joseph,
historical setting of the day of J. p. 240;
origin of Egyptian name of J., p. 161-164, 261–2;
Conversation with Pharaoh, p. 72;
the tale of two brothers, p. 262;
the famine of Baba, p. 263;
the Pharaoh that "knew not Joseph," p. 267.
Joshua,
archaeological book of J., pp. 119–121, 301–302.
Kadesh Barnea,
Turning back from, pp. 283, 293.
Knossos,
discoveries at, p. 39.
Law,
the law a code, p. 148;
some items added later, pp. 147, 294;
patriarchal customs according to, pp. 242–245.
Literature,
interpretation of, p. 26;
difficulties of interpretation, pp. 23–29;
only one solution in problems of, p. 34;
aided by historical inquiry, p. 26;
etymological, analytical and speculative methods, p. 27;

LITERATURE—Continued
Hebrew literature, p. 177;
interpretation of rubrics, p. 27;
interpretation of the account of High Places, p. 28;
Moses lived in literary age, p. 284;
literary marks in Pentateuch, pp. 148, 152–172;
prophetic history and literature, pp. 322–334.
LITERARY FORM,
guidance concerning, p. 23;
literary cannons must be learned from each age, p. 26;
modern form of literature much to do with modern standards, p. 24;
archaeology makes clear ancient form, p. 25.
LOT,
rescue of, p. 249–250.
MELCHIZEDEK,
mysterious character of, p. 77;
mystery eliminated, p. 78;
esteemed unhistorical by Nöldeke, pp. 132–135;
esteemed unhistorical by Wellhausen, p. 103.
MENES,
historical, p. 39.
METHOD OF RESEARCH pp. 214–218.
MINOS,
historical, p. 39.
MOAB,
identified, p. 99;
Moabite, stone, 316.
MONARCHY,
Sudden emergence of Israel's culture at, pp. 305–307.
MONUMENTS,
deciding voice of monuments in biblical criticism, p. 30;
ground of the claim, p. 31.
MOSES,
importance as lawgiver, pp. 145–149;
minimized by reconstructive theory, 145–46;
this theory not sustained by archaeology pp. 146–149;
MOSES—Continued
Moses in Egypt, p. 275;
any account of in Egypt? p. 275;
tablet of 400 years, p. 275;
story of M. fits into Egyptian history, p. 276;
age of M. a literary age, p. 284;
Laws of Pentateuch from M., p. 148;
Egyptian evidence for Mosaic age of Pentateuch, pp. 154–172, 284–294.
MYTHOLOGY,
mythological views of Scripture, pp. 101–112, 149–159;
Schultz concerning, p. 102;
Nöldeke concerning, p. 103;
Wellhausen concerning, p.103;
Delitzsch concerning, p. 103;
Reuss concerning, p. 104;
E. Meyer concerning, p. 104;
Gunkel concerning, p. 111;
Barton concerning, p. 105;
Jeremias concerning, p. 104;
mythological view of Scripture refuted by archaeology pp. 105, 152;
Hommel on this refutation, p. 106;
Clay on this refutation, p. 106;
myths claimed as the origin of Israel's religion, pp. 149–154;
reference to myths proper in the Bible, pp. 152–153;
astral myths, p. 149;
Abraham among the myths, p. 150;
mythological view of the Hittites, p. 108;
Budge concerning, p. 108;
refuted by discoveries 109;
adequacy of archaeological evidence concerning mythological theories, p. 109;
"P." DOCUMENT,
not confirmed by araeological researches in Palestine, pp. 299–304.
PALESTINE,
Palestinian civilization in patriarchal age, pp. 87-93; 142, 237–250;

PALESTINE—Continued
high state of civilization in patriarchal age, pp. 85–93;
Babylonian influence in days of Patriarchs, pp. 86, 232;
semi-barbarous condition claimed for patriarchal days, pp. 87–93, 141;
"P." document not confirmed in P., p. 299–304.
origin of Israel's religious culture in P., pp. 93–97;
condition at time of exodus, p. 296;
gradual invasion of, pp. 119–122;
code of Hammurabi in, pp. 87, 242–245;
Egyptian booty from p. 92;
Tell el-Amarna tablets, in pp. 87, 246;
discussion of civilization of, p. 142;
ignorance claimed for Palestine in patriarchal age, pp. 82–87;
political boundaries of, pp. 308–322;
excavations in, p. 299;
mingling of early civilizations in patriarchal times, p. 120.
PATRIARCHS,
Palestinian civilization in patriarchal age, p. 246;
ignorance of patriarchal age, pp. 82–87;
Von Bohlen concerning ignorance of patriarchal age, p. 83;
Dillmann concerning ignorance of patriarchal age, p. 83;
Driver concerning ignorance of patriarchal age, p. 84;
Orr concerning ignorance of patriarchal age, p. 85;
Reuss concerning ignorance of patriarchal age, p. 83;
theory of ignorance discredited by archaeological research, p. 85;
patriarchal customs conformed to law, pp. 87; 242–245;
high moral ideas among, pp. 87–93;
PATRIARCHS—Continued
Kuenen concerning high moral ideas among, p. 89;
George Adam Smith concerning high moral ideas among, p. 88;
Babylonian influence on, pp. 86, 237–245;
high state of civilization in patriarchal age, pp. 91, 87–93;
patriarchs, not persons but personifications, pp. 137–141;
archaeological evidence concerning, p. 139;
relations between Patriarchs and Hyksos, pp. 69–73;
reception of Patriarchs in Egypt, p. 71.
PENTATEUCH,
Pentateuchal question, pp. 284–294;
Mosaic authorship of, pp. 284–294;
late authorship of, pp. 154–173;
fallacious arguments for late authorship of, pp. 154, 175;
Egyptian evidence against late authorship of, pp. 161–172;
Egyptian evidence for Mosaic age, pp. 161–172;
obscurity of the doctrine of the resurrection in p. 288;
Egyptian words in, pp. 161–172.
PHARAOH,
that "knew not Joseph," p. 267;
oppressor of Israel, p. 268.
PILGRIM,
Abraham a pilgrim, p. 73;
the first pilgrim father, p. 248.
PHILISTINES,
on political horizon of Israel, p. 316.
PHOENICIANS,
in Egypt, p. 71.
PITHOM,
"At the mouth of the East," p. 278.
POLITICAL,
political boundaries of Palestine, pp. 308-322;

Political—Continued
Egypt on political boundary of Palestine, pp. 309-322;
Philistia on political boundary of Palestine, p. 316;
Moab on political boundary of Palestine, pp. 317-319;
Syria on political boundary of Palestine, p. 319;
Assyria on political boundary of Palestine, pp. 319–322;
Babylonia on political boundary of Palestine, p. 322.
Presuppositions,
necessary to thinking, p. 20;
guidance concerning, p. 20;
oftimes determines what one sees, p. 175;
fallacies introduced by, pp. 175–177;
presuppositions of the Bible, p. 175;
presuppositions of the reconstructive theory, pp. 162, 175.
Problems,
many solutions of mathematical problems, p. 34;
only one solution of problems in life, literature and history, pp. 32–39.
Progress,
progress of testing of critical theories by archaeological facts, pp. 7, 221–339.
Prophetic,
prophetic history and literature, pp. 322–336.
Providence,
Wideness of God's providence, p. 295.
Ptah Hotep,
precepts of, p. 147.
Rameses,
land of, pp. 285–288;
oppressor of Israel, p. 269–270.
Reason,
in human guidance, p. 39.
Red Sea,
crossing of, 278.
Religion,
comparative study of, p. 93;
Religion—Continued
astral myths claimed in Israel's religion, pp. 93–103, 149–154.
Resurrection,
obscurity of doctrine in Pentateuch, p. 288.
Revelation,
progress in, p. 255;
concerning Cities of Plain, p. 68.
Rosetta Stone,
effect of discovery of, p. 37.
Sacrifice,
human sacrifice, p. 256.
Semites,
Semitic civilization, p. 234;
Semitic language in Egypt, pp. 250, 274.
Sennacherib,
relations with Israel and Egypt, pp. 313, 322.
Scriptures,
importance of historical study of S., p. 18;
geographical and topographical trustworthiness of S., pp. 48–52;
ethnographic correctness of S., pp. 52–54;
correctness of imagery of S., pp. 58–61;
accuracy of S., p. 60–61;
mythological views of S., pp. 101–112.
Shalmaneser,
puts Jehu to tribute, p. 322.
Shishak,
relations with Israel, p. 311–312.
Sinai,
location of, p. 280.
Slavery,
Hebrew slavery in Egypt, pp. 267–274.
Sodom,
cf. Cities of the Plain.
Speculation,
scientific and unscientific speculation p. 182.
Syria,
relations with Israel, p. 319.

Tabernacle,
in the wilderness, pp. 280–283;
account of, when written?, p. 280.
Tablet of 400 Years,
does it refer to Moses? p. 275.
Tell el-Amarna Tablets,
in the civilization of Palestine, pp. 87, 246.
all sorts of people writing at that time, p. 87.
Theories.
to be tested by facts, p. 31;
not correct simply because they work, pp. 32–39;
not affecting historicity and integrity of Scripture, pp. 45–80;
affecting historicity and integrity of Scripture, pp. 81–113;
Theories—Continued
theory of the mythical character of Israel's religion, pp. 149–154;
theory of mythical origin of scriptural narratives, pp. 101–113;
critical theories just now challenged, pp. 114–122;
reconstructive theories not confirmed, pp. 123–172;
presuppositions of reconstructive theories, p. 176.
Tutankhamen,
relation the oppression of Israel, p. 268.
Volition,
human volition an element in problems of life, literature and history, p. 34.
Xenia Seminary Expedition to cities of the Plain, p. 253.

Publications of Bibliotheca Sacra Co.

Every Minister
Every Bible Student and
Every Christian Worker

should read

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly. Editor-in-Chief, Melvin Grove Kyle. $3.00 a year.

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

The Ice Age in North America, and Its Bearings upon the Antiquity of Man. 5th Edition. 200 illustrations. 800 pages. 8vo, cloth, $5.00, postpaid.
Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History. 3d Edition. 40 illustrations. 450 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.
Origin and Antiquity of Man. Many illustrations. 550 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.
Story of my Life and Work. 476 pages. 12mo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.
See Ohio First. 93 pages. 8vo, paper, 60 cents, postpaid.

HAROLD M. WIENER

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. 255 pages. 8vo, cloth, $1.50, postpaid.
The *Coup de Grâce* to the Wellhausen Critics.
The Origin of the Pentateuch. 150 pages. 8vo, paper, 40 cents, postpaid.
A Comprehensive Answer to the Wellhausen Critics.
Pentateuchal Studies. 350 pages. 8vo, cloth, $2.00, postpaid.
The Wellhausen Critics *in extremis*.
The Date of the Exodus. 27 pages. 8vo, paper, 20 cents, postpaid.
The Religion of Moses. 36 pages, 8vo, paper, 25 cents, postpaid.

EDWARD H. MERRELL

The Person of Christ. 192 pages. 12mo, cloth, $1.00, postpaid.

MELVIN GROVE KYLE

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism. Revised Edition. 364 pages. 8vo, cloth, $2.15, postpaid.
Moses and the Monuments. 300 pages. 8vo, cloth, $2.15, postpaid.
The Problem of the Pentateuch. 310 pages. 8vo, cloth, $2.15, postpaid.

JOHN ELLIOTT WISHART

The Spirits of Just Men made Perfect. 178 pages. 12mo, cloth, $1.00. postpaid.

Because

1. They are all the works of experts.
2. They are all abreast of the time.
3. Their style is so simple and clear that they are adapted to the wants of laymen as well as those of scholars.
4. They uphold orthodox systems of doctrine.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, 6834 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo., U. S. A.

Property of
Catourette Library
WCIU

William Carey Int'l University
3 1539 0007983